

c.a.u.t. BULLETIN de l'a.c.p.u.

SPRING

1970

PRINTEMPS

Forum on the CUG Report at the
University of Toronto

Commentary on the Macdonald Report

Traitements de l'exercice 1969-1970

Salaries

VOLUME 18 TOME

NUMBER 3 NUMÉRO

THE CANADIAN ASSOCIATION OF UNIVERSITY TEACHERS
ASSOCIATION CANADIENNE DES PROFESSEURS D'UNIVERSITÉ

CANADIAN ASSOCIATION OF UNIVERSITY TEACHERS

Association	President	Secretary	Treasurer
Acadia	Agar Adamson	Hantford Graham	David E. Misener
Alberta	W. E. Smith	F. D. Cook	P. F. G. Adams
Bishop's	C. L. Arnot	G. R. Weller	R. Reeve
Brandon	H. M. Hutton	D. N. Adams	E. V. Pemberton
U.B.C.	W. D. Liam Finn	Muriel Niemi	
Brock	J. A. Moore	Howard E. Bell	Howard E. Bell
Calgary	D. H. Norrie	Miss Evelyn Moore	Dennis Kadatz
C.M.C.	R. Leduc		
Carleton	Cooper Langford	C. L. Chakrabarti	J. T. O'Manique
Dalhousie	K. Leffek	D. W. Lawrence	Lionel Lawrence
Guelph	M. A. MacGregor		N. V. Bowen
Lakehead	S. Magwood	E. Zimmermann	B. Philipps
Laurentian-Laurentienne	G. I. Clarke	D. A. B. Pearson	W. R. Cook
Laval	L'Abbé Louis O'Neill	Michel Lecours	Pierre Vézina
Lethbridge	J. L. Rood	L. G. Hepler	E. G. Mardon
Loyola	R. Hanrahan	D. McElcheran	P. Richardson
Manitoba	W. R. Wall	J. Tinkler	D. W. Daycock
McGill	Trevor Lloyd	J. T. Parry	P. J. Harris
McMaster	D. W. Carment	J. Browning	Valerie M. Warrior
Memorial	J. Tague	F. B. Rowe	Mrs. J. M. Foltz
Moncton	Roger Savoie	Jean Dumas	R.P. Jean-G. Gagnon
Montréal	Jacques Brazeau	G. de Montigny	Jacques Falmagne
Mount Allison	Elmer Tory	Kevin Noon	Kevin Noon
Mount St. Vincent	L. Wainwright	Melvin Heit	R. P. Seth
U. New Brunswick	I. Unger	Michael Taylor	N. Iverson
Notre Dame of Nelson	R. Bonney	W. Munch	A. Bartsch
Nova Scotia Tech.	Charles Miller	D. Thirumurthi	D. Thirumurthi
Ottawa	Michel Roussel	C. Granger	Jean-Marc Beauchesne
Queen's	D. Canvin	J. A. Bennett	A. M. Macleod
St. Francis Xavier	Ronald MacKinnon	Patrick Walsh	Patrick Walsh
St. John's	John Kendle	George Baldwin	Peter Noel-Bentley
St. Mary's	Urhan S. Merdsoy	D. L. Mulrooney	D. L. Mulrooney
Sask. Regina	D. T. Lowery	S. I. H. Naqvi	S. I. H. Naqvi
Sask. Saskatoon	R. C. Nicholson	J. G. McConnell	R. G. Beck
Simon Fraser	John Walkley	Alden Sherwood	E. Kiehlmann
Sir George Williams	Neil Compton	Irving Smith	Norman Smith
Toronto	J. M. Rist	R. J. K. Barker	R. W. Missen
Trent	C. Carter	A. M. Young	R. B. Morris
Victoria	Leo I. Bakony	Miss Charlotte Girard	Phoebe Noble
Waterloo	J. D. Ford	Mrs. J. Spowart	H. W. Kerr
Waterloo Lutheran	K. Bongart	J. Hall	T. Miljan
Western	M. Keenleyside	T. F. Siess	C. M. Gow
Windsor	A. Gnyp	Mrs. C. A. Querbach	Ralph Kolinski
Winnipeg	Victor Batzel	Marcien Ferland	Brian Evans
York	W. H. Coons	David Cliphsham	Harvey Simmons

association

président

secrétaire

trésorier

ASSOCIATION CANADIENNE DES PROFESSEURS D'UNIVERSITÉ

c.a.u.t. BULLETIN de l'a.c.p.u.

Spring
Volume 18, Number 3

1970

Printemps
tome 18, numéro 3

TABLE OF CONTENTS — TABLE DES MATIÈRES

	Page
The Commentary on the Macdonald Report	2
Reform of University Government at the U of T <i>F. E. Winter</i>	16
The CUG Report: A Student's View <i>Gus Abols</i>	25
The CUG Report: How to nail jelly to the wall <i>J. M. Robson</i>	32
Sociologie à l'Université de Moncton	43
Canadianization and the University	47
Office news	55
Report on Salary increases <i>R. Holmes, G. Rosenbluth</i>	58
Dalhousie Faculty Association letter	62
Traitements de l'exercice 1969-1970	64
Book Reviews <i>E. J. Monahan</i>	72
Notice of Positions Vacant — Annonce des postes vacants	78
Notice of Persons Available for Appointment — Annonce des professeurs disponibles	89

A Publication of The Canadian Association of University Teachers
Publié par l'Association canadienne des professeurs d'université

Executive Secretary	Alwyn Berland	Secrétaire général
Editor	Edward J. Monahan	Directeur
Associate Editor	Wilfrid M. Dubé	Directeur adjoint

C.A.U.T. National Office
233 Gilmour St., Ottawa 4, Ont.
Advertising Office:

233 Gilmour St., Ottawa 4, Ont.

Secrétariat de l'A.C.P.U.
233, rue Gilmour, Ottawa 4, Ont.
Publicité :

Published four times a year in October,
January, April and August.
Subscription Rate : \$5.00 per year.

Quatre livraisons par année : octobre,
janvier, avril et août.
L'abonnement est de \$5.00 par année.

Postage paid in cash at third or fourth class
rates on permit number 3064.

Affranchissement en numéraire comme objet
de troisième ou quatrième classe, permis
numéro 3064.

THE COMMENTARY ON THE MACDONALD REPORT

by a Special Committee of the C.A.U.T.

This committee was created in March 1969 and was composed of the following : G. Rosenbluth (Chairman), V. Adamkiewicz, A. Berland, L. Gauvin, J. G. Kaplan.

Introduction

*The Role of the Federal Government in Support of Research in Canadian Universities*¹ is the report of a study group under the chairmanship of Dr. John B. Macdonald. The study was sponsored jointly by the Science Council and the Canada Council, but the report cannot be regarded as a report of these official bodies. It represents the views of the study group alone, which was selected by Dr. Macdonald.

The terms of reference for the study group were these :

“To examine and make recommendations on —

1. The present level, sources, and conditions of financial support for research in the universities.
2. The broad purpose and objectives of the Government and the universities that should be served by the research support program.
3. The principles and policy that should be adopted in attaining these objectives.
4. The organization, mechanisms and management practices that will best meet the principles and objectives that are defined by the study” (p. V).

The report is, however, weighted far too heavily toward a consideration of the last of these problems while the others — particularly numbers 2 and 3, are dealt with only superficially. The question of purposes and objectives is discussed intelligently, if briefly, in the first chapter (13 pages), but this discussion does not sufficiently illuminate the remainder of the report which is 361 pages long.

Our evaluation of the *Macdonald Report* was guided by the following considerations :

¹ John B. Macdonald, L. P. Dugal, J. Stephan Dupré, J. B. Marshall, J. Gordon Parr, Ernest Sirluck, Erich Vogt, *The Role of the Federal Government in Support of Research in Canadian Universities*, with a Minority Report by L. P. Dugal, The Queen's Printer, Ottawa, 1969 (referred to as the *Macdonald Report*).

1. While most university charters assign to the universities an obligation to carry out research as well as teaching, and while universities dispose of facilities for teaching, they are hampered in the implementation of their research obligations by inadequate research budgets.
2. University professors have a basic right to do research as well as to teach. This follows from the charters as well as from the presently accepted definition of a university professor's role. But while a professor may usually exercise his right as teacher without difficulty, his right as researcher is often curtailed by outside organizations that control research funds.
3. Universities have played the preponderant role in basic research which in turn is responsible for most other advances in knowledge. Although at any one time basic research may or may not be of interest to outside agencies, its value is unquestionable. Therefore adequate measures must be established to guarantee the existence of basic research in the universities.
4. Universities are the primary agencies for the teaching of the principles and techniques of research. Although supervised by the professor, such instruction may or may not be part of his research programme. It may or may not yield immediate research results. Special consideration must be given to research training in formulating budgets for both teaching and research.

Since we will have much to say that is critical of the *Macdonald Report*, it is important to stress at the outset that we are in complete agreement with what we take to be its basic view. This is the view that the research function is of central importance both in the life of the university and in the life of the nation, and that an expansion of federal support in all fields of university research is to be encouraged. This view requires emphasis at this time, since there is a danger that, under the influence of the current enthusiasm for the teaching function, the research function will be neglected, particularly by provincial politicians looking for ways to cut the budget.

1. *Composition and Approach of the Study Group*

1.1 The study group consisted of seven individuals, including one former university president, one vice-rector, two deans, a director of an institute, an awards officer for the National Research Council, and one common or garden professor. In terms of disciplines, the seven indi-

viduals represented Micro-biology, Biology, Physiology, Physics, Engineering, Political Science, and English. One additional individual is described as a "participating consultant" who did not share in the writing of the actual report. He is a vice-dean and a sociologist.

1.2 It is evident that the problems and concerns of university administrators were not under-represented on the study group. It is also clear that the problems and concerns of the natural sciences, particularly the biological and health sciences, were well represented, while the representation of the humanities and social sciences was very thin by comparison.

1.3 Perhaps the composition of the committee accounts for what is the most remarkable feature of the report. It is written as if the most important objective should be to make life less complicated for the university administrator, and to increase his control over the activities of the faculty.

1.4 This feature of the report seems to derive from two implicit premises, neither of which we find acceptable. The first is that the dominant purpose of federal support of research is to strengthen the universities. The second is that universities are monolithic structures whose "interest" is to be identified with that of their administrators.

1.5 We agree with the Canada Council's remarks on the first premise in its commentary on the *MacDonald Report*.

Research councils, must, of course, avoid creating difficulties for the universities, but their prime responsibility is towards the research community. Scholars will therefore find it strange that the authors show so much concern for an affective partnership between research councils and universities rather than between councils and researchers or learned societies. The misunderstanding unfortunately colours several of the conclusions and recommendations of the report.²

1.6 It goes without saying that we also find the second premise lacking in realism and unacceptable.

2. *Research Support in Social Sciences and Humanities*

2.1 The treatment of research in the social sciences and humanities is quite inadequate; whether this inadequacy is caused by the com-

² The Canada Council, *Commentary on the Macdonald Report*, mimeographed, May 20th, 1969, p. 2.

position of the study group is unclear. The report points out that precise data on research support in the areas of the social sciences and humanities is very thin, but proceeds to make recommendations with as much vigour and certainty as in those areas for which it claims extensive knowledge. There is a note of special pleading in much of the discussion of research support in these areas. Thus, the report cites findings at 10 universities which provided research support of \$100,000 or more from general revenue in 1966-67. The report points out that, "with four exceptions, these universities gave substantially more of their limited support to science-engineering than to social sciences-humanities" (p. 32). The report then offers the consolation that the *proportion* of funds given to social sciences-humanities from this internal source is higher than from outside sources, and even calls attention to the *one* university where social sciences and humanities together received all of the general revenue research funds. The section ends with this generalization: "One could hardly postulate a policy that has deliberately favoured the sciences and engineering" (p. 32). It is unclear whether this refers to each of the individual universities administering its own funds, or to some other source of policy. And it is not at all clear that, with several exceptions, just such a policy does not exist at many universities. However, to state the conclusion in this manner is to beg the question; the real problem is not necessarily in some explicitly stated policy, but in the resultant facts. This conclusion ignores the fact that at the 10 reporting institutions (Table 3:7), 54% of all funds went to science-engineering; 5.9% to health sciences, 22.3% to social sciences, and 17.8% to humanities. During this period outside support for the sciences and engineering was very much richer and more easily available, and presumably one justification for internal research funding was to help overcome the imbalance in external support. In 1967-68, for example, total Canada Council research grants in social sciences and humanities came to two million dollars; NRC grants, exclusive of major equipment grants, in the same year came to 24½ million dollars (Tables 4:5 and 4:6).

3. *Federal Research Councils*

3.1 Recommendations 1 through 5 of the report advocate some reorganization of the existing structure of research councils. There are to be three councils, dealing with the natural sciences and engineering, the health sciences, and the humanities and social sciences, respectively. We agree with this general principle, but not with all of the details of the reorganization proposed by the study group. Moreover, we strongly disagree with the view that the main function of these councils should

be to finance *university* research, the councils should be equally responsible for the development of research outside the universities. Research in non-university institutes and laboratories, and by independent individuals should be encouraged, and institutes and laboratories should be developed where they do not already exist. In view of the increasing emphasis on teaching in the universities, it is particularly important to develop institutions in which the many productive research workers who have no talent or liking for the teaching function can be employed to the greatest advantage of society and themselves. Moreover in the humanities and social sciences, "spare time" work by individuals not attached to any research institution or university is still a very important source of productive research. In the natural sciences this position implies that while we agree with the study group's view that the allocation of funds should be separated from the administration of government laboratories, we feel, unlike the study group, that the National Research Council should continue to be responsible for the financing of these laboratories.

3.2 If the research councils are to be effective working groups, their membership should be closer to 10 than the 19-24 proposed by the study group. The study group takes the view that the larger number is required in order for the councils to be representative, but the kind of representation sought by the study group is neither necessary nor desirable.

3.3 Representation of university administrators should be confined to one or two members who can supply information about the problems of administration involved in university research. "The greater public" is already well represented in the government which will make the basic decisions about the allocation of funds between the councils, and does not require to be represented again on the councils. Membership on a council should be almost totally confined to those with some expertise in the council's field of operation. This does not mean, however, that representation should be confined to researchers who are potential recipients of council funds. Others who are expert in the area of research concerned, such as scientists in the federal or provincial governments and in industry, can serve usefully as council members.

3.4 We disagree with the study group proposal that senior executive officers should be members of the councils. There is a real danger that "permanent mandarins" might dominate the allocation of grants. The study group's argument in favour of its proposal is that membership of senior executive officers on the governing board prevails "not only

in private enterprise, but in Crown corporations (p. 111).” This is not a useful analogy.

3.5 To coordinate the work of the three councils, the study group recommends an “inter-council coordinating committee” composed of “the presidents of the three councils, together with such staff and advisors as they deem necessary (p. 107).” This is an example of the study group’s propensity to recommend an excess of administrative organization and to specify the organizational structure in excessive detail. Coordination among the councils will certainly be necessary, particularly since one may look forward to the development of important interdisciplinary research projects. It is reasonable to suppose, however, that the councils will evolve the necessary machinery for consultation and coordination, and it is a mistake to impose such machinery from the start, and from above.

3.6 We are in agreement with the study group’s views concerning the machinery to be used by the councils in evaluating research projects. Each proposal is to be examined by two outside referees and judged by a review committee of persons actively engaged in research in the field concerned. The work load of each committee should be small enough to permit careful examination of each proposal. “To ensure a constant infusion of fresh thinking,” tenure on a committee should be limited to a three or four year non-renewable term. Replacement members should not be chosen by the committee itself, in order to avoid “the risk of inadvertently perpetuating biases.” We understand that while present practice is, in general, in accordance with most of these principles, there are significant exceptions.

4. *Advisory Groups*

4.1 The study group recommends that the Science Council be augmented by “appropriate representation” of the social sciences and be given the task of advising the government on “what constitutes an appropriate balance in the respective research efforts of government, industry, and universities (p. 112).” We disagree with this proposal. As indicated above, the councils themselves should determine the appropriate balance of research effort between universities, non-university institutes and laboratories, and independent individuals. Insofar as advice is required, it should be obtained from those qualified in the discipline in question, such as representatives of the learned societies concerned. The Science Council would lack the necessary expertise, even after the addition of social scientists to its membership.

4.2 In addition to the research activities financed by the councils, there will continue to be applied research in various government departments and in industry. The latter will, presumably, continue to be subsidized by government grants and tax concessions. The relation of these activities to those financed by the councils is a political question and as such cannot be settled purely by appeal to expert advice. It would be a mistake for the government to treat the advice of the Science Council in this area as having a special quality of impartial expertise. It is desirable that the government be exposed to a variety of viewpoints, including those of research workers actively engaged in the disciplines concerned. In general, we think the proper role for the Science Council would be to review and recommend on the government's performance, rather than acting as a pressure group of its own.

4.3 To advise the government on the allocation of funds between the three research councils, the study group recommends a "Canadian universities research advisory committee" composed of "persons closely acquainted with university operations (p. 114)." This suggestion again reflects the study group's concern with the problems of university administrators. It is hard to understand why close acquaintance with the operations of universities should confer wisdom in the allocation of funds between the natural and social sciences. The study group's suggestion also reflects its view that the councils should be concerned only with *university* research, and we have already stated our disagreement with this view.

5. *Criteria Governing Grants*

5.1 The study group recommends that the primary considerations in judging grant applications should be the merit of the proposals and the qualifications of the applicants. We are in agreement with this suggestion, but we do not think that merit and qualifications should be the only criteria in all cases. Consideration must also be given to the encouragement of research at all universities and in all parts of the country. Indeed, since research is as much a duty of the university professor as teaching, no faculty member whose merit is sufficient to earn him a post at a Canadian university should be deprived of the tools of research. However, we think that the federal research councils should not be saddled with the burden of providing for *all* university research. Since university charters define a primary function of the university to be research, there is an obligation on provincial governments and university administrations to guarantee each professor a quantum of research support.

5.2 In the evaluation of research proposals some consideration should also be given to the extent to which a particular proposal contributes to the teaching function of the university, by training graduate students, or in other ways.

5.3 It follows from these considerations that while we agree with the study group's suggestion that the National Research Council's "non-adjudicated grants" should be terminated, we think the timing of such a withdrawal should take into account the development of other sources of research funds. It goes without saying that "non-adjudicated" funds should not be "non-accountable."

5.4 To encourage universities to establish centres of excellence in specific areas, the study group recommends that the federal research councils consider applications for "negotiated development grants" designed to build on strength. We agree in principle with this recommendation, but would wish to add two important reservations :

1. that such development grants in no way discourage grants to individuals working outside such formally defined "centres of excellence" in the same or similar fields; and
2. that this policy in no way discourage the development of new and additional centres of excellence where these are academically and economically feasible.

6. *Costs to be Covered by Research Grants*

6.1 The study group recommends that research grants by the councils should cover the direct costs of research, excluding however the cost of the time spent on research by the university faculty members concerned. In addition, an amount equal to 35% of direct costs, is to be paid to the university administration to cover "indirect costs."

6.2 We believe that detailed rules of this kind impose a straight-jacket on the councils, which can seriously hamper the effectiveness of their research support. The exclusion of a salary or maintenance component for faculty members from the grant is appropriate in many cases, but inappropriate in some. If, for example, the project requires that a faculty member's teaching duties be reduced for a period, it is quite appropriate that a part of his salary be provided by the council. Most university administrations would be reluctant to reduce teaching duties below the normal level, unless some such arrangement were made. Moreover, in many fields faculty members can perform contract research for what the study group calls "mission-oriented agencies" on terms which

involve a contribution to salary in return for a reduction in teaching load, and it is of the utmost importance that the terms for free research financed by the councils, should be competitive with those of contract research.

6.3 Similarly, in the social sciences and other fields, faculty members have opportunities for contract research which contribute to their personal incomes during the period of the year when they are not engaged in teaching, and the Canada Council is finding that it is necessary to offer competitive terms, in order to encourage basic research. It has become standard practice at United States universities for faculty members to earn an additional two-ninths of salary if they devote their time to basic research during the Summer. Similar arrangements exist at some Canadian universities, and if basic research in many fields is not to dry up, they must spread. It is unreasonably rigid to exclude the councils from the financing of such arrangements.

6.4 We therefore urge that the question of salary and maintenance support be left for each council to determine, and that no government policy statement or regulation binding the councils be laid down in this matter.

6.5 The figure of 35% for indirect costs is obtained by the study group from data supplied by five universities for what the study group calls the "A.U.C.C. Cost Study" (actually, a study sponsored jointly by the C.A.U.T. and the A.U.C.C.).³ The study group classified all university operating costs into "direct" and "indirect," and found that the indirect costs amounted to 35% of direct costs. Quite apart from its unreliable statistical base, the figure of 35% is quite arbitrary. The study group fails to distinguish between indirect costs which would not be incurred if the research project concerned did not go forward, and true overhead costs which would be incurred in any case. It is reasonable to suppose that a high proportion of indirect costs are in this latter category, and there is no particular justification for loading a pro rated share, or any other given amount, on to the cost of a research project.

6.6 Moreover, as the study group recognizes (p. 136) the federal government already pays one-half of these indirect costs in the form of grants to the provincial government. The study group disposes of this matter by arguing that the formulae under which provincial govern-

³ Vincent W. Bladen (chairman), L.-P. Dugal, The Hon. M. Wallace McCutcheon, Howard I. Ross, *Financing Higher Education in Canada*, Report of a Commission to the Association of Universities and Colleges of Canada, University of Toronto Press, 1965.

ments redistribute this money to the universities make insufficient allowance for these indirect costs. We suggest that if this is the case, the recommendation that should flow from it would be for an improvement in provincial grants formulae and procedures.

6.7 We believe that there may be a justification for a loading of 10% to cover the indirect costs directly attributable to a research project, but that the figure of 35% is far too high. It would greatly dilute the effectiveness, in terms of research produced, of the limited funds that the federal government can be expected to put at the disposal of the councils. It would encourage provincial governments and university administrations in the belief that they have no serious responsibility for the support of research. And it would make the normal operations of the university dangerously dependent on a steady flow of federal research grants.

6.8 We recognize that there will occasionally be major projects (such as the T.R.I.U.M.F. project in Western Canada) where all costs are in fact "direct" and the project will not go forward unless the total cost is borne from the federal funds. In these cases we agree with the study group recommendation that total funding should be provided.

7. *Tax Status of Grants*

7.1 The study group recommends that all research fellowships be deemed taxable. This recommendation has become more topical with the publication of the government's white paper, *Proposals for Tax Reform*, in which it is proposed, "in fairness to other tax payers, that fellowships, research grants, scholarships and bursaries be treated as taxable income."⁴ We find these recommendations regrettable and ill-considered. Fellowship support, generally speaking, is at the minimum level required to accomplish its objective. If such support as is now non-taxable becomes subject to taxation, the support levels will have to be raised to maintain the same net-after-tax level. The result must either be that the funds made available to the councils are increased by an equivalent amount, in which case the government is merely shifting money from one pocket to another, or that the real amount of research support that the councils can give must decline. We believe the latter effect is almost inevitable. The political process by which the government's funds are allocated to different uses is not so finely tuned that the amounts allocated would be sensitive to changes in the recipients'

⁴ E. J. Benson, Minister of Finance, *Proposals for Tax Reform*, The Queen's Printer, Ottawa, 1969, p. 11, 1.37.

tax status. The net effect of the proposal must therefore be to diminish the amount of real research support.

8. *Computing Costs*

8.1 The study group recommends that "the present form of N.R.C. grants to university computing centres be discontinued, and that computing for research be supported from the normal operating grants of all federal research councils (p. 133)."

8.2 In support of this proposal the study group argues that when computing is free, "there is little recognition among legitimate users of the actual costs of computing or of the need for restraint (p. 134)." In addition to this important point the study group makes remarks to the effect that each major user "should be made accountable for his major costs," that computing centres are now sufficiently mature to be supported by "the normal mode of operating grants," that it is desirable "to normalize administrative procedures," and that current policy "unnecessarily inhibits the use of commercial facilities (p. 133)." These remarks do not bear close examination and reflect an obsessive preoccupation with a concept of normality in which the different parts of the university operation are self-liquidating, no one gets "something for nothing," and the university has a duty to provide a market for commercial facilities. The study group cites the counter-argument that no one would think of running a university library on these principles, and replies to it by citing survey results to indicate that computer use is very unequally distributed among faculty members. Any faculty member who has the slightest acquaintance with the habits of his colleagues, will know that this is true of library use.

8.3 We agree that it is necessary to prevent the wasteful use of computer facilities, but it does not follow that it is either necessary or desirable to charge full computing costs to each research project. The user can be forced to be economical in his use of computer time by any device which limits the amount at his disposal. This may be rationing in terms of "computer dollars" as is practiced now at many universities, or a real charge to be paid for out of research grants; in this case there is no reason why it should correspond to the study group's notion of full cost, assuming that such a concept can be identified uniquely, which it cannot.

8.4 There are certain branches of the natural sciences and engineering in which the use of computers is now so well established that

it would not be inhibited by even a high hourly charge (provided this can be financed from a research grant), and in which the amount of computing required for a given project can be predicted with fair accuracy. The situation is however very different in many branches of the social sciences and humanities, where the use of computers is very much in its infancy, and a great deal of experimentation by individual faculty members is still required as they learn to make effective use of this important tool. In these areas the development of computer use would be seriously inhibited by high charges for computer time.

8.5 Moreover, as we have indicated above, it is necessary to provide the tools of research even to those members of faculty that have failed to obtain a council grant at a particular time. This too requires free or low-cost access to the computer.

8.6 The truly efficient system is therefore not that which corresponds to the study group's strange notion of normality, but one which, like the present system, separates the problem of financing the multi-purpose computing installation from the problem of rationing its use to research users and preventing waste. The former problem should continue to be solved with the help of block grants. However, there is no reason why the National Research Council should be the only source, and cooperative financing by the three proposed councils would be preferable. The councils might then negotiate an agreement regarding a low hourly rate to be charged to research users, and incorporated in research grants, for the purpose of rationing computer time and preventing waste.

9. *Mission-Oriented Agencies*

9.1 We are in agreement with the general proposition that some university research can be sponsored and financed by operating government departments and Crown corporations. The report refers to these as "mission-oriented agencies." We do not think, however, that it is necessary or desirable to draw up, as the study group does, detailed instructions to these agencies as to how they should manage their research contracts and grants.

9.2 We are opposed to recommendation 34, which states that "any mission-oriented agency be eligible to apply for authority to fund the full start up costs of university research institutes designed to be of service to governmental and industrial clients (p. 162)." Such service is not the purpose of a university. It is recognized that in some pro-

fessional schools, service to clients may be a legitimate part of the training of students and the research activities of faculty. In these cases, however, the service function should be incidental and secondary to the primary research and teaching function. It would therefore pervert the purpose of the university to have institutes whose primary aim is service, and which are financed by outside agencies whose primary interest is in obtaining service.

9.3 We are very much in agreement with the recommendation that "neither government nor universities attempt to enter into arrangements involving universities in work that cannot be published (p. 161)." But we do not share the study group's willingness to tolerate exceptions to this rule which is implied in the statement: "Any exception to this principle should be subject to the most formal review procedures in both the university and the agency concerned (p. 161)." In our view, *NO* secret (or non-publishable) research should be conducted at universities except at times of national emergency. The university's purpose is the advancement of knowledge, and knowledge is not advanced when it cannot be communicated. Formal review procedures that might be invoked to consider exceptions to this principle should not be considered except in time of national emergency. Further, we recommend that universities have the responsibility of providing appropriate screening agencies to recommend on the acceptability of research projects, and their suitability to the proper function of the university.

10. Capital Grants

10.1 We agree with the proposal that a federal-provincial conference be convened to consider the means whereby the federal government can make a direct contribution to the construction of laboratories and other research facilities.

11. Administration and Accounting

11.1 As has been indicated before, the bulk of the study group's recommendations deal with details of administration and accounting. We agree with some of these suggestions and disagree with others, and feel in general that they offer an excess of detailed direction for which there is really no call.

11.2 We welcome the *Macdonald Report's* emphasis on the importance of federal contributions to university research. We regret its bureaucratic approach to many problems, which leads to unsound rec-

ommendations, and we deplore the report's preoccupation with administrative details.

V. Adamkiewicz (Immunophysiology, Montréal)
L. Gauvin (Physics, Laval)
J. G. Kaplan (Biology, Ottawa)
A. Berland (Executive Secretary, C.A.U.T.)
G. Rosenbluth, Chairman (Economics, U.B.C.)

FACULTY OF EDUCATION

THE UNIVERSITY OF CALGARY

1970-71

Invites applications for :

Academic staff positions as indicated in the following departments, appointments to become effective July 1, 1970, or subsequently as may be arranged. For details concerning these positions please write to the Department Head.

Department

Head

Curriculum and Instruction :

Dr. S. A. Lindstedt

with specialization in the following subject areas —
secondary social studies, school libraries, physical sciences,
foreign languages, reading and mathematics; in
audio-visual education.

Educational Administration :

Dr. J. E. Cheal

with a strong background in social sciences, and
experience in conducting and supervising research.

Educational Foundations :

Dr. R. F. Lawson

with specialization in history of education, and sociology
of education.

Educational Psychology :

Dr. J. G. Woodsworth

with an interest in the general field of educational
psychology, and with strong teaching and research
backgrounds in one of the following fields : developmental
psychology, learning, special education (other than
mental retardation), counseling, computer applications
in education.

The above appointments will be made at a rank appropriate to academic and professional background and qualifications. Salary ranges for 1969-70 are as follows :

Instructor — \$7,750 to \$10,250; Assistant Professor — \$10,300
to \$13,750; Associate Professor — \$13,800 to \$18,550; Pro-
fessor — \$18,600 and up.

A FORUM ON THE REPORT OF THE COMMISSION ON UNIVERSITY GOVERNMENT AT THE UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO

Because of the widespread interest in the recently published Report of the Commission on University Government of the University of Toronto and its potential significance for higher education in Canada, we have invited three members of the University to present their comments on the Report. It is hoped that this will contribute to the continuing discussion of the many important issues raised in the Report by members of the Canadian university community.

E. J. M.

REFORM OF UNIVERSITY GOVERNMENT AT THE UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO

F. E. Winter *

The official title of the report of the University of Toronto's Commission on University Government is *Toward Community in University Government*.¹ However, the Commission itself, almost from its inception in the fall of 1968, had been familiarly known as CUG (rhyming with "rug"), and the anticipated result of its labours as "the *CUG Report*." I have yet to hear the Report described by its official title.

Both CUG itself and the *CUG Report* are remarkable events in the history of Canadian university government. Probably both will prove to have been highly characteristic of university politics of the late sixties. A decade ago it would have seemed farfetched indeed to propose that the university should establish and finance a commission on university government, whose voting membership consisted of four faculty, four students and the President, with members of the existing Board of Governors and alumni representatives present only in a non-voting capacity. On the other hand, by 1980 CUG's recommendations may seem to have been too much attuned to the political pressures of the moment, and too little to the long-term interests of the university. It is therefore important that the *CUG Report* be carefully considered in all sectors of the University of Toronto. It is unlikely that any of us will be able to foresee accurately the conditions of 1980. Yet careful weighing of

* Professor Winter is a Professor in the Department of Fine Art, University of Toronto, and past-president of the Association of the Teaching Staff.

¹ *Toward Community in University Government*, Report of the Commission on the Government of the University of Toronto, University of Toronto Press, Toronto, 1970 (references are indicated according to the book-form edition).

the CUG proposals may at least save us from burdening the university of the twenty-first century with a set of outworn responses to the problems of the nineteen-sixties. After all, the last major revision of the U. of T. Act took place in 1906; on this basis the CUG proposals could still be the blueprint for government in 2035 !

Given the composition of the voting membership of CUG, most of the debate was almost bound to focus on the issues of university government as seen by faculty and students. The views of the Board of Governors, the alumni, and members of the Provincial Legislature would be welcomed, but would be assessed from the special standpoint of faculty and students. Both the Association of the Teaching Staff (A.T.S.) and the Students Administrative Council (S.A.C.) had taken the stand that faculty and students alone constituted "the university," the administration being essentially a "civil service." However, many faculty members opposed even the sort of student involvement in government advocated by the more moderate of the student activists; the demands of the extreme radicals were rejected as utterly incompatible with the nature and functions of the university. This faculty-student opposition would have been less obvious, and probably of less consequence, on the type of committee originally envisaged by the Board of Governors (2 governors, 2 administration, 2 faculty, 2 students, and the President). On CUG as actually constituted the opposing viewpoints were bound to come out much more clearly. Thus both S.A.C. and A.T.S. were adopting a risky policy in joining forces to demand a "parity body" of 4 faculty and 4 students, in place of the four constituencies proposed by the Board of Governors. In retrospect, I believe that while the risk was a calculated one on the part of S.A.C., many A.T.S. members did not fully realise the "political" consequences of their action, and so were unprepared for the sort of report that CUG finally presented.

That the Commission presented any report at all was an achievement of considerable magnitude. As Chairman of the A.T.S. for the whole period during which CUG was meeting, I received digests of most of its discussions. It was soon evident that the faculty and student members disagreed on a wide range of topics, and that the Commission was unlikely to survive as a viable body unless the opposing groups could devise a set of compromises acceptable to all concerned. The Commissioners themselves frankly admit that their *Report* is a compromise between conflicting viewpoints; but they stress that it also represents a consensus to which all members felt that they could

subscribe. In view of the long hours of debate required to reach this consensus, it is ironic that the earnestness of their efforts to achieve a consensus should now be one of the grounds on which they are attacked from both the faculty and the student side. The basis of this attack seems to be the argument that where opposing views are strongly held, efforts to achieve consensus leave everyone except the negotiators dissatisfied, and that therefore such efforts are hardly worthwhile. This argument is sound enough in purely academic debates; in the practical politics of human interrelationships it seems to me to be an open invitation to violent disaster.

Nevertheless, it remains true that the *CUG Report* has provoked some dissatisfaction in almost all quarters. Many student activists complain that the *Report* sidesteps the issue of the university's rôle in society; while a "traditional" view of the university is briefly, and a "radical" view more extensively, set out, the Commissioners take no firm position on either. Instead, they continue as follows: "If ideological differences and historical developments threaten the unity of the university as a community, it can only survive... if its members agree to work according to a few principles that the majority can accept."² Some of these principles are then defined: common participation in the activity of learning, and in working for a self-governing and self-adapting community, and common acceptance of established policies, so long as the reasons for these are clearly stated and understood, with all parties sharing in their establishment.

Compromises such as these seemed to many radicals to be a sellout to the "established power structure", and to ensure that really substantive changes in the university would be slow in coming, if they came at all. Many faculty members on the other hand were equally convinced that the interests of the university (not just the narrow interests of the faculty) had been sold out to the student activists. The *CUG Report* has seemed to some to have a predominantly "anti-faculty" tone; it certainly endorses (some claims of the Commissioners to the contrary notwithstanding) the *principle* of staff-student parity at all levels of university government, even though not recommending *automatic application* of the principle; and its proposals give to students a considerable influence in matters of faculty appointments, promotion, tenure and dismissal, and of research policy — matters in which many members of the faculty believe students to be generally unqualified to make judgments.

² *Ibidem*, p. 32.

Soon after the publication of the *CUG Report* the President, in consultation with the A.T.S., S.A.C., and G.S.U. (Graduate Students Union), established a body known as the CUG Programming Committee. This committee was charged with promoting and directing debate and discussion of the *Report* throughout the university community, as a necessary preliminary to the formulation of procedures for implementing, or rejecting, or simply shelving, the *Report's* 107 recommendations. The Programming Committee has received a large number of comments from individuals and groups, and has sponsored a series of public meetings for discussion of the *Report*. It is not surprising that comments have been mostly critical; those who are strongly opposed are usually more concerned to present their criticisms than supporters are to declare their support. Much more disturbing (whatever one's views about the *CUG Report*) has been the general lack of interest that has been evident at most of the public meetings. It seemed to me early in December that few students had read the *Report* at all, and that many faculty had not read all of it; I believe that this view is still substantially correct.

Still, in the light of discussion to date it is not hard to identify the aspects of the *Report* that have provoked the strongest reactions:

- 1) The Commissioners, though they avoid endorsing faculty-student parity as an automatic requirement of all levels of university government, clearly felt that parity, or at least the right to have it instituted on demand, should be the normal pattern in the university of the future.

- 2) The *Report* recommends a considerable voice for students in new appointments and promotions other than to the rank of full professor. For the granting of tenure and promotion to full professor the Dean should be advised by a committee of his Faculty Council consisting of : himself or his designate as Chairman; the Chairman of the department concerned; one faculty member and one student from each of the Faculty Council and the departmental personnel committee; and, where appropriate, the Graduate Dean or his designate and a graduate student chosen by the graduate students in the department. Clearly, in some cases this soliciting of student opinion would give students a voice in dismissal procedures as well.

- 3) Students are given a voice in the setting of research policies and the allocation of research funds.

- 4) The *Report* proposes the establishment of "enforceable" rules governing consulting activities by full-time faculty.

5) The Commissioners have been sharply criticized for failing to come to grips with the diversity of functions and problems of the "non-academic" or "support" staff of the university. At present members of various groups in this category share little more than a feeling that they are all second-class citizens of the university community.

6) The Commissioners come out strongly in favour of a unicameral form of government, with a single Governing Council replacing the present Senate and Board of Governors. This Council would have a membership of 66 : 20 faculty, 20 students, 20 lay members, the President, 4 presidential appointees, and the head of one of the Federated Colleges (the seat to rotate among them).

7) The *Report* anticipates that much of the university's business will be conducted in a large number of committees at all levels : departmental, college, faculty, and Governing Council. It has been seriously questioned whether personnel to man all these committees would be forthcoming, especially from among the students.

Of these seven areas of concern the third, fourth, and fifth have probably seemed less disturbing to the faculty than the others. The proportion of faculty members who are extensively involved in consulting work is probably not large; in any event some sectors of the university have already made progress in establishing standards (enforcement of course may be quite another matter). Most faculty members also recognize the need for carefully coordinated research policy; indeed many of us feel that major reform in this area is essential. The involvement of students in the setting of research policies is another matter altogether. Yet even here I wonder how much faculty misgiving is due to fear of ideological aberrations, among students, that have no parallels among faculty members, and how much to the brusque and forthright, not to say bruising, manner in which students often express their ideological objections.

Of the problems of the non-academic staff I am afraid neither students nor faculty have a particularly good record. Of course academic administrators at all levels have a keen appreciation of the qualities of the secretarial and technical staff, upon whom they rely heavily. Most faculty, however, and almost all students are likely to regard all categories of non-academic staff as simply part of the "machinery" — their successes taken for granted, their mistakes roundly condemned. Speaking as a faculty member I think I must say that we are almost all guilty here — even the members of CUG — of violating the ideal of a com-

munity of people in which all members are entitled to respect and consideration as individuals, regardless of differences in the quantity and quality of their contributions to the community. Perhaps the saddest commentary on our failure is that in general we are simply unaware of having failed, and too little concerned when our shortcomings are drawn to our attention.

The issues of parity and of student involvement in appointment, promotion, tenure, and dismissal, are of more immediate interest to members of the teaching staff than is the rôle of the support staff in the university community. The Commissioners themselves clearly expected strong faculty reaction to their recommendations in these areas. Indeed it seems clear to me from the record of their meetings that when the issues were first raised by the student members, the reactions of the faculty members were much the same as those of the faculty at large since the publication of the *CUG Report*. Moreover, I believe that most faculty are aware that the faculty members of CUG did change their views on these issues in the course of the Commission's discussions, and fully acknowledge their right to have done so. What is not accepted is the right of the Commissioners to expect the faculty at large to experience a similar "conversion" just from reading the relatively brief argumentation contained in the *CUG Report*.

I must say also that I do not believe faculty misgivings to be really based primarily upon "fear . . . that student participation in personnel matters will inaugurate an era of witch-hunts and ideological purges."³ It may be true that some faculty members, especially in highly "politicised" Social Science departments, entertain fears of this nature. For this situation the student activists themselves are largely responsible, for they have rarely as a group disowned the wilder and more hysterical pronouncements of a relatively few extremists. It may also be true (it could scarcely have been otherwise in the highly charged atmosphere of the Toronto campus last Fall) that some faculty reactions were inspired more by hysteria than by reason. Nevertheless, the Commissioners were disingenuous in emphasizing "fear of witch-hunts and ideological purges" as a major cause of faculty opposition to staff-student parity and to student involvement in personnel matters. Faculty concern surely springs from a much deeper and more fundamental source, namely, their convictions about the proper functions of the university and about the best methods of fulfilling those functions. The *CUG Report* recognizes these convictions, in a somewhat oblique way, in quoting from Frank Under-

³ *Ibidem*, p. 48.

hill's 1964 essay, "*The Scholar : Man Thinking*." ⁴ The presentation, however, seems to me (even though I happen to share the Commissioners' convictions !) over-simplified to the point of being misleading.

To many faculty members the university is above all else an institution devoted to freedom in the pursuit of knowledge for its own sake. If the governing structure of the university is such that essentially academic policy decisions, e.g. in matters of research, curriculum and personnel, cannot be approved without lengthy political manoeuvring and trade-offs, then research directed to the disinterested pursuit of knowledge will lose its primacy in the university's way of life. First, a great deal of valuable time will have to be devoted to "campaigning" for the "political" acceptance of particular research projects. Second, in the long run the necessity for winning such "political" acceptance will discourage faculty members from proposing projects simply for the sake of expanding knowledge in a particular field. Third, new staff appointments and the establishment of new courses in certain sensitive areas will probably be shelved out of sheer frustration, and these areas will be largely neglected. By the time this stage is reached the university will no longer be devoted to the pursuit of knowledge for its own sake; instead, it will be on the way to becoming a service organization for the social and political ideologies that happen to be dominant at any particular moment — exactly the role currently imputed to it by the student radicals, and one which they ringingly condemn.

Until the student radicals honestly recognize the validity of faculty misgivings in these matters, the two parties will remain at loggerheads; for there is, I believe, a very real danger that the current direction of campus politics could produce the sort of result indicated above. However, I personally feel that the fears expressed by some faculty members are exaggerated. In any event I do not see how, at this moment in its history, the university can advance its best interests without taking some calculated risks. We have to choose one of two courses in the years ahead. On the one hand, the government of our university can be reformed and restructured by a process that includes members of the university community as well as the Provincial Legislature. On the other, we can acquiesce in a continuation of the existing situation, in which decisions about the future — and especially about the future government — of the university, are made entirely by the Provincial Government, with the advice perhaps of a lay Board of Governors and

⁴ Frank H. Underhill, *The Scholar : Man Thinking*, in *A Place of Liberty*, ed. G. Whalley, Toronto, 1964, Clarke Irwin, pp. 61-71.

senior administrators, but in splendid isolation from students and faculty, i.e. from the only groups who are really qualified to pass judgment on the university's effectiveness as a centre of teaching and research. If we choose the second alternative, we may well be opting for the *status quo*, with no significant changes whatsoever. This choice must surely be ruled out for anyone with the least experience of trying to get the Toronto elephant to move, or indeed to halt after movement has commenced. Yet as soon as we choose change of any sort we risk unforeseen and unpleasant consequences. It seems to me self-evident that we shall be able to deal with such situations far more effectively under a system of government dominated by representatives from within the university community, elected by and from the various estates which make up that community.

Three major objections have been raised, however, to the unicameral and university-dominated Governing Council proposed in the *CUG Report*. First, it hands over the management of a \$100-million-per-year enterprise to a Council dominated by faculty and students, with no guarantee that such a Council would act prudently and responsibly in the spending of public funds. Yet in my experience academics who find themselves in positions involving budgetary responsibility can be counted on to display an awareness of the implications of those responsibilities that might well be more widely emulated outside the university. Furthermore, the 20 lay members of CUG's Governing Council would have the specific responsibility of criticizing anything that they regarded as a woolly-headed proposal by academics. I must add also that I have been at the University of Toronto long enough to remember how strongly an advisory committee appointed by President Sidney Smith argued against massive expansion of the original U. of T. campus, and how both the committee and President Smith himself urged an early start on the creation of new suburban institutions. The Provincial Government and a lay Board of Governors decided instead to concentrate for several years on the creation on the dehumanized monster now known as "the St. George Campus," and to delay any start on suburban colleges and campuses (Scarborough and Erindale) until the final costs had had a chance to rise to a suitably astronomical figure. I cannot see how a Governing Council dominated by faculty, or faculty and students, could have done any worse.

A second objection to CUG's Governing Council, and one which seems to me to have validity, has already been mentioned: the failure of the Commission to give adequate representation to the "support staff,"

and to recognize the wide diversity of services rendered by the people in this area. As a result, the support staff complain that they will have no voice in determining policies by which they will be affected; and many faculty members will still be free, simply from lack of information to the contrary, to harbour suspicions about "bureaucratic empire-building" in the non-academic sectors.

Finally, there is the criticism, already noted above, that time and personnel for all the committee work proposed by CUG would be difficult to find, especially in the student sector. I believe that as far as faculty are concerned this criticism overlooks the tremendous amount of time already devoted to work on committees — whose efforts, incidentally, at times duplicate, and even "triplicate", each other under the present system of government, or, alternatively, cancel each other out. Careful calculation, I suspect, would show hardly any increase in the number of committees in moving from the present system to the CUG system. However, more people would certainly be expected to take part; and some of those faculty members who now do very little, if any, committee work may not relish the prospect. On the student side, it is undoubtedly true that recent experience in several universities indicates an unwillingness on the part of many students to become involved in administrative committees. I would hope that greater participation would be forthcoming in a completely restructured university government of the CUG type; but if our hopes were disappointed, faculty members should not complain, inasmuch as the opting out of the students could only strengthen the faculty voice on the Governing Council. Personally, I am confident that the students would accept their new responsibilities; I heartily concur in the statement of a colleague, that a university in which the CUG proposals won't work ought not to exist.

To me the *CUG Report* is a bold and imaginative attempt to bring the university community into closer touch with today's world. Obviously, such an attempt is bound to be largely experimental; and any experiment runs a considerable risk of ending, at least in the short term, in failure rather than in success. I think almost any member of the faculty and student bodies would be prepared to suggest modifications and improvements in the *Report*. I very much hope that in the months ahead discussion will not be limited to negative criticism of the CUG proposals, as has so often been the case to date, but will proceed to suggest constructive alternatives to any proposals that seem contrary to the best interests of the university as a whole.

THE CUG REPORT : A STUDENT'S VIEW

Gus Abols *

I am pleased to have the opportunity to comment on the recently published report by the Commission on University Government of Toronto. I should like to point out that these comments are entirely my own, and do not reflect necessarily, those of my Council.

I intend to restrict my comments to basically three topics; parity between faculty and students; the role of the students in firing, hiring, promotion and tenure; and the top Governing Council, both its composition as well as its relationship to the provincial government.

The Commission was established in the Winter of 1968 and reported in the Fall of 1969. The Association of Teaching Staff in October of 1968 approved the Students' Administrative Council's proposal for the structure of CUG. It was essentially a *parity body*, consisting of equal numbers of students and faculty. The A.T.S. turned down the proposal made by the Board of Governors (the Board had proposed representation from four estates : the Board, the students, the faculty and the administration).

At the same time that the A.T.S. agreed to participate in the Commission structured on a parity basis, it passed an additional motion stating :

... that a condition of the Association of Teaching Staff involvement in the new committee was a commitment by the Board to submit the committee's report to the provincial government without change and without additional delay...¹

In view of the present faculty opposition to implementation of the major recommendations of the report, it is interesting to speculate on what the faculty had expected to gain from participating in the Commission whose structure they determined in large part.

On parity, which is considered a right in the report, the Commission felt :

If, indeed, the university is to be controlled by its academic components, power should be shared. The strongest arguments for parity between faculty and students are based both on the student

* Mr. G. Abols is enrolled in the Faculty of Law, University of Toronto, and is this year full-time President of the Students' Administrative Council.

¹ *Toward Community in University Government* (Toronto, 1970), p. 14.

commitment to and interest in the learning process, as well as very important political and psychological realities : unless students feel secure in their influence and are, indeed, given considerable influence, participation becomes merely token. Our recommendations for departments call for joint student-faculty negotiations to determine the actual makeup of councils and committees, . . . ²

The Commissioners assumed that since they had been able to come to an acceptable solution, and since they were a joint faculty-student parity body that the A.T.S. had endorsed, that the above proposal would be readily acceptable to faculty. Events since the publication of the report show how naive the assumption was. Faculty is not ready to accept this principle if it threatens its power.

The Commission continued :

... A solution cannot be imposed by either students or faculty upon one another. If people are to live together, they must be able to agree to the basis of that relationship.

Where negotiations are not feasible, at the faculty level or above, we provide for parity in the representation of students and faculty as a *right*, with additional participation by academic and senior administrators, lay people and alumni. Our recommendations at these levels [departmental] provide for flexible student representation, from none at all to parity with elected faculty, depending upon the wishes of the students involved. ³

Parity is stressed as a "right" since otherwise, decisions may be arbitrarily imposed by the side that has the numerical advantage. This fear has been justified by the actions of faculty since the publication of this report. This year the A.T.S. and the Faculty Council have rejected parity for students and have refused to allow students any role in hiring, firing, promotion or tenure.

Many of you reading the above may feel that students have no role to play in the matters of appointments, promotion, or tenure. However, there is a very important principle involved here, not just a specific issue. Unless students are guaranteed an equal voice at the departmental level, any issue that becomes emotional or threatens the existing power of faculty would undoubtedly be resolved in the interests of faculty and not in those of the students. This could happen despite the fact that

² *Ibidem*, p. 40.

³ *Ibidem*, pp. 40-41 (*Italics mine*).

the students' complaint may be legitimate. In short, unless the power of the students is equal and is institutionalized, students have no assurance that faculty would consider the interests of the students in critical matters.

Some readers may not believe faculty would ever act irrationally, nor would these same readers believe that faculty would ever act otherwise than in a spirit of benevolent paternalism. However, what may be rational to faculty is not necessarily rational to the students. The two estates do not necessarily make the same assumptions. Faculty may have more experience, but I'm certain that they would not suggest that experience alone produces wise decisions. The student viewpoint measured against faculty experience could not help but make the educational experience more realistic.

I may add that unless faculty assumes that all or most students are unreasonable, I am sure that a reasonable debate on major issues would sway most faculty and students alike. It is false to assume that most debates would end in deadlock and not reasonable compromises.

In view of the theoretical war over parity that is going on at this campus, one can only conclude that the members of faculty, who are waging this war, are acting irrationally. To institute parity as allowed by CUG would necessitate approximately 4,000 students. I personally doubt that this number of students would be willing to participate. The Carleton experience is a case in point. If faculty would stop theorizing and start to involve students in the departments, it would quickly discover that parity is an imagined threat. In fact students could not be found to fill all the positions, and should they be found, many of them would defer to the experience of faculty and act as a rubber stamp legitimizing faculty-originated proposals.

In addition, parity is of vital importance at this stage of our history where there is no accepted consensus as to the aims of the university community. The opinions of administrators, faculty members and students are essential in the re-evaluation of our educational institutions.

Lastly, faculty has argued that it should have a greater institutionalized voice than students in decision-making in the department since their commitment to the university as an institution is greater than that of the students. This sounds very much like suggesting that property owners should have a vote while the landless peasantry, who have nothing to lose but their lives, should not. Another example of this attitude can

be found in the American Constitution in which slaves were not considered to be full persons.

The second issue that I would like to comment on is the extremely sensitive one of student participation in appointments, promotions and tenure. CUG recognizes that "appointment is clearly linked with curriculum and the general direction of a department and a discipline, both of which must be considered integrally."⁴ Except in cases of tenure, CUG allows department councils exclusive jurisdiction over appointments and promotions, while tenure would be decided by the Faculty Council. Promotion, appointment and tenure would be based upon recommendations made by either an *ad hoc* committee or a permanent, personnel committee. Students would be represented on such committees in *such proportions as were determined by the original negotiations which established the department or Faculty Councils* within whose jurisdiction the decisions would fall.

The opinion of the majority of faculty members of this university is quite clear. They are generally opposed to the admission of students to *any* committee concerned with appointment, promotion, tenure or termination of appointment. This view has been expressed by motions of the A.T.S. and the Faculty Council this academic year, as well as by petitions last year. Even the CUG compromise is unacceptable to faculty.

However, most members of faculty are willing to allow themselves to be evaluated on their teaching ability by students. They say that this is all that students can competently assess. Also it is argued, such criticism would not in itself threaten "academic freedom" and "professional standards" which the faculty claim they are trying to preserve by excluding students — any students. Even one student is one too many.

The faculty is in fact suggesting that teaching ability and scholastic ability are separable. This may be so, but often I have heard them argue that the best scholars are often the best teachers. I wish they would be consistent.

Furthermore, students have a legitimate concern in not only how they are being taught, but also in what they are being taught and the quality of the subject matter being offered.

Surely it is conceded that if they are competent to assess teaching ability they are equally capable of assessing quality of content. The

⁴ *Ibidem*, p. 49.

rationale for the two must be the same since students don't have "experience" with either problem.

Unfortunately, I have seen only too often that faculty, not unlike politicians, responds to the needs of students only if the students have some real power over it, whether such power is institutionalized or informal. The fear of power as a motivating device is recognized by most members of faculty who daily exercise power over negligent students by lowering their marks if their essays are late.

Students, unless they are involved in the questions of appointment, promotion and tenure would have no way of assuring that teaching ability, let alone content, would be a factor in the selection of staff; nor would they be sure that professors with teaching ability would be retained on staff; nor would they be assured that good teachers would be adequately rewarded by being promoted. Professors who would like to teach, at least during the academic year, would continue to live under the fear of being released for not publishing sufficiently. I know personally several professors who have been rated by their students as good teachers but who live in fear of losing their jobs.

To argue as some people do, that this is being remedied now that attention has been brought to the problem by student unrest, does not ensure that the problem will not recur in the future unless the solution is institutionalized. CUG has tried to cure the cause, not merely the symptoms.

Lastly, for faculty to pretend that appointments or promotions are made merely on the basis of academic excellence is blatantly dishonest. We know that who you know in a department seems often to be as important in finding a job as is the question of what you know or how well you know it.

The third topic that I would like to deal with is the Governing Council. Recommendation No. 107 states :

That there be established a *sole* governing authority with final control over all financial and academic matters within the University of Toronto to be named by the Governing Council (see Draft Statute). That the membership of the Governing Council of sixty-six members be distributed in the following manner :

20 lay members,

20 elected students,

20 elected academic staff,
6 ex officio members.⁵

The six ex officio members include the President, one representative of the constituent universities and four appointed by the President. The twenty lay members are made up of ten appointed by the government, and ten elected from the graduates.

Although I agree with a *unicameral* body, I find that the composition of the body as proposed is unacceptable since power would lie with the elected staff and students. Both of these groups are essentially transient in nature.

Few of the faculty and even fewer of the students would know or understand the historical foundations of the institution. Presently the institution plays a key role in the life of the province, as well as in the country. It is an institution older than Confederation itself. It is an institution with an international reputation that I feel should be preserved and protected. Leaving the bulk of the power to a transient group, threatens this aspect of the university.

Another significant criticism of the structure of the Governing Council was raised by the alumni observers on the Commission. To quote from their dissenting paper :

... In our view this composition is weighed far too heavily toward elected Faculty and students who may lack the experience and management competence required to administer an institution of the size and complexity of the University of Toronto, whose annual operating budget, before provisions for capital expenditures, exceeds \$100,000,000. In view of the vagaries of the election process, there is no assurance that an adequate number of academic administrators ... will be members of the Governing Council. As the province supplies more than two thirds of the University's funds, and as the community at large is vitally concerned with the well-being of the institution, which is of major importance to our society; we believe that government appointees should at least be equal to those generated by students or staff.

The alumni recognized two dangers in the Governing Council as proposed. The first is the simple question of the complexity of the university. Although I myself have been a full-time president for almost ten months,

⁵ *Ibidem*, p. 178 (Italics mine).

there are still many aspects of this university with which I am not familiar, despite the fact that I have endeavored to learn as much as possible about the institution. Faculty and students elected for a short period of time, meeting infrequently and involved in their jobs and studies can not possibly make informed decisions on the needs of the entire community. In fact, they run the serious risk of making decisions that inadvertently would adversely affect many areas of university life.

More dangerous is the fact that society at large is not ready to accept the new Governing Council. Many citizens feel already that too many of their tax dollars are going to support "ivory tower" academics and "irresponsible, long haired hippies that don't know what they want." To now ask them to give these two groups \$100,000,000 annually to distribute as they feel fit, invites direct government intervention in the life of the university.

The government has to respond to political pressure if it wants to survive.

As the university is presently structured, the government appoints the ultimate governing body, the Board of Governors. These are essentially people with a good deal of business acumen. Furthermore, the provincial government controls the universities indirectly to some degree through the Department of University Affairs. Politically, the real benefit of these two bodies to the university is that they act as a shield against public pressure to "do something" about campus unrest. To remove this shield and allow the government next to no control in the affairs of the university, as the faculty or students define these affairs, increases the likelihood of either significant withdrawal of financial support, or direct government intervention in the operation of the university. Therefore I personally feel, as do the alumni, that the government (hopefully reflecting the interests of the community) be allowed to appoint a significantly larger group to the Governing Council than CUG envisages.

In conclusion, I would like to say two more things. I would like to stress that there are many questions which these three issues raise which I have not dealt with because of the lack of space. I have selected those aspects which I feel are most interesting and significant. Lastly I would like to emphasize that students are not seeking to override the powers that the administration and faculty have held for so long, but rather for the opportunity to act responsibly in a process vital to the whole community.

THE CUG REPORT, OR, HOW TO NAIL JELLY TO THE WALL

John M. Robson *

The Report of the Commission on the Government of the University of Toronto, *Toward Community in University Government*, contains, in its fifty-nine tabloid pages, 107 recommendations, dispersed among four main chapters. It certainly can't be covered in one brief article. But fortunately (ambiguity intended) it is not meant to be a blueprint for Canadian universities; it properly concentrates on the special situation, historical and contemporary, at the University of Toronto. Nonetheless, the wider issues have relevance elsewhere, and I shall focus on these. It's difficult, however, to respond other than as an individual — especially when one is on sabbatical leave — and so my comments will reveal my bias as a professor at a Toronto college, as a humanist, and as a student of English.

Actually, the wide range of individual responses is itself a gauge of the problem. If there had been agreement, even "consensus" (whatever that may mean), there would have been no need for a Commission of this sort; the *Report* is meant to explore the possibilities for agreement, and the Commissioners came to feel that their recommendations were the only way to achieve unity (or, as they would say, to preserve it, for they believe that "the university is still in fact a community" [p. 5; 19]).¹ But is such community present, and is unforced agreement possible? I have grave doubts.

The history of the Commission and its *Report* is instructive. Even before the Commission was set up, the Association of the Teaching Staff and the Students' Administrative Council insisted that it should report directly to the Government of Ontario. As a result the Commission represented no actual body; it was responsible to no one; and there was no real provision for action on the recommendations. No one was much concerned about this peculiarity, for it was argued that only the Government could change the University Act, on which all other changes depend. But the Government, as one would expect, received the *Report*, and said that it wouldn't act until it knew what "the University" thought about its recommendations.

* Professor John M. Robson is a Professor in the Department of English, Victoria College, University of Toronto.

¹ The first number indicates reference to the tabloid edition of the *CUG Report*. The second number refers to the book-form edition now published by the University of Toronto Press. (Editor)

The President, Claude Bissell — who has suffered from ill-considered and stupid criticism from all sides — called for continuous and widespread debate on the issue of greatest priority, the nature, powers, and composition of the supreme body, the “Governing Council,” and a CUG “Programming Committee” was established to encourage and organize debate on that and other issues raised by the *Report*. The debate is now on, especially with reference to the Governing Council, the role of students in government (the key problem being student involvement in appointment, promotion, and tenure decisions), and (less centrally) the duties and rights of “support staff” (as the non-academic staff is being called).² If anyone can see a consensus emerging, he has better eyesight or rosier glasses than I. A questionnaire is to be issued, and then a “University-Wide Committee” is to be “assembled” in the Spring, which will meet “perhaps for two days,” to discuss, and hopefully [*sic*] to resolve, the question of the top governing structure If necessary, further meetings could be arranged for the Fall The results of the deliberations of the University-Wide Committee would be given to the President for submission to the Province as the voice of the University.”³ On this Committee of 160 (would you believe it ?) are to be forty students, forty faculty, forty administrators and support staff, and forty others (from the Board of Governors, alumni, presidents of staff and student bodies, and the Senate). Both students and faculty are to have a veto power, for a majority of each must approve all measures. I don’t know how any such body can be expected to reach agreement (not just majority approval) in two days, or two-and-twenty, or twenty score.

Of course one must face the fact that the CUG Commissioners, chosen to represent divergent views, came to present a unanimous report. This unanimity staggered me. I had expected to find more evidence of disagreement; indeed I expected a minority report. How — in the continued and evident presence of basic disagreements on the campus — did the Commissioners manage to agree on 107 recommendations, without a dissenting voice ?

The answer would appear to lie in the circumstances in which the Commissioners found themselves. When they first sat down together,

² A published record of the debate may be found in the pages of the University of Toronto *Bulletin* and the student newspaper, the *Varsity*. There is no point in trying to summarize the contributions to this debate, a few of which have reached a high standard of expression and argument (see, e.g., Stewart McLean’s letter, *Bulletin*, 8 Jan., 1970), except to remark that some of them reveal a strongly critical view of the recommendations for a unicameral system (long favoured by President Bissell) and for student parity as a principle.

³ *Bulletin*, 23 Jan., 1970.

nine good men and true, ⁴ they faced the immense problem of designing a government, at all levels, for an enterprise with an annual budget of over \$100,000,000, in times when there was a widespread belief, and some evidence, that if something was not done, and done quickly, that enterprise would cease to function. They began in an atmosphere of tension, with some suspicion, and a good deal of excitement. As they got to know one another, the tension became what we have learned to call "creative," with mutual respect and liking growing, and a common sense of dedication developing. Although, as some Commissioners have said since the *Report* was issued, the split over student parity remained to the end, and certain strong (but disembodied) disagreements about the role of the contemporary university are given place in their *Report*, they clearly came to see their primary function as a preservative one. While aiming to transform the university into a self-regulating and self-modifying institution, they also had the aim of preserving the University of Toronto in roughly its present size and performing roughly the same functions (plus some others). The "actual task of the Commission was to discover those positive areas of agreement within the university that would guarantee that it could sustain itself as a community, and to suggest practical structures for governing such a community" (p. 5; 19). In brief, the threat was that the University would cease to function: the Commissioners, facing that threat, came to agree that the University should continue to function as a unit and in the same areas that it now malfunctions. It's hard to see how, as responsible men, they could have come to any other agreement; and it's even harder to see how, as equally responsible men, the current debaters could challenge that agreement without neglecting pressing local issues.

But the malaise runs deeper, as at least those in the Faculty of Arts and Science at Toronto should know, after having spent more than two years altering degree and programme structures without touching in any true way the teaching and learning processes. Human societies develop institutions to meet needs and desires, and in time those institutions become outmoded, as needs, desires, and circumstances change. Adjustments can be, and often are, made, but finally a time comes when more than adjustment is called for. Is it not likely that we have come to such a time? Certainly the radicals say so, citing the irrelevance of universities

⁴ There were in fact three more, representing the Board of Governors and the graduates — including as alternates even some women — but they didn't have a vote. And they did dissent. But their views were, incredibly, not spelled out in the *Report*, though no one argued that their voice were unimportant — indeed the *Report* calls for representation of just such voices on the new Governing Council. The Commissioners also decided to do without the impartial chairman called for in C.U.G.'s composition, and alternated between staff and student co-chairmen.

in their present form, and arguing for their downright perniciousness. The latter charge must seem unpersuasive to those faculty members who have, each in his own way, tried to serve their students — and, by extension, their community — and have many testimonies of their success in so doing. To the radicals' charge that they are serving out-moded needs, they honestly answer that certain human needs continue, no matter what the social structure, and they see their function as continuing to serve those needs. This is my own position, and peering into the murky present I don't see how any humanist can avoid saying *plus c'est la même chose* about certain aspects of teaching and learning.

But only about certain aspects. There are many distressing features of that ill-defined baggy monster, the multiversity, including bad management (as distinct from bad administration) and making bad management efficient by introducing irrelevant business practices. These cannot be dwelt on here. But the worst feature, for many students at least, is the incoherent and aimless education offered, especially in the Social Sciences and Humanities. Since Newman's superb presentation of the argument for the gains of cross-fertilization through the study of all disciplines in one university (though he excluded the professions), we have all, in our higher moments, looked for unity in diversity, and so we should. But Newman's unstated premise was that all the members of his university shared attitudes about the value of disinterested inquiry, and about the general purposes of life, into which the particular purposes of a university could fit. And this premise does not hold for modern universities. There are extremely wide divergences among faculty members and among students, divergences reflecting, but not determined by, their particular areas of competence and interest. And the demands and pressures of Canadian society on the universities are much more widely varied than many of us seem to have realized; at least we have perhaps all realized that they are far more complex and immediate than those of a hundred years ago.

On the present evidence, and we've had lots of it from all around the world, there are deep rifts separating groups within the universities, rifts not defined simply by the conflict of generations, but created by incompatible views of the social and human functions of education. As one group or another gains control in one area (witness the triumph of the "progressives" in elementary and secondary education in Ontario), people fall into the rifts trying not to bridge them, but to get at one another's throats. Power over others, not control over oneself, becomes the issue, and continuing unhappiness the condition.

The *CUG Report* recognizes that there are serious divisions, but suggests, both by direct statement and strong implication, that the only two camps that need be considered are the "Traditional" and the "Radical." What I would argue is that these are the two main and articulated responses to the difficulties, but that they do not exhaust or even take account of certain realities; as a result, those who feel compelled to take part in the battle often appear or become more rigid than they really are, while those who are unwilling to narrow their perspectives are lumped improperly with the unconcerned and apathetic — and this unfortunate group contains a majority of students, as all campus elections bear witness.

While a full analysis is impossible here, some points must be mentioned. Society demands, and its demands will be supplied in some way or other, competent professionals in many fields, ranging from the traditional professions to new and now hazy occupations that will assume professional status. Competence in these areas depends on different methods of education: what is suitable for Medicine, for example, is not suitable for social work or Physics or teaching. Furthermore, individual areas are often themselves very diverse in the demands that are made of persons: as an extreme instance, the radical demand for "people's" lawyers suggests a kind of education different from, and incompatible with, the demand (not likely to disappear) for corporation lawyers. These incompatible demands are represented in the students now in universities, though often those in the supposedly non-professional disciplines think that all is peace and repose in the professional schools.

Another reality little cited in the *lutte corps à corps* is the psychological need of late and post-adolescents to be engaged in pragmatic tests of their abilities and goals. We now are committed to keeping in regular educational systems a majority of young people in their late teens and a large group through their twenties. There's nothing in recorded human history to suggest that such a situation is other than explosive or debilitating, as the desires for achievement, of whatever kind, will either find futile outlets (such as student power) or, through suppression, lead to moral and psychic paralysis.

Yet another reality, suggested by the last, is the truly staggering cost, in lives as well as money, of contemporary universities. About this we tend either to wag our heads or to shout our mouths off. In the debates at Toronto last year a distinguished colleague displayed Miltonic blindness if not Miltonic power in arguing that if the new curriculum

cost more money than we had any reasonable expectation of getting, the students would tell their parents, who would go out into the streets to force the Provincial Government to disgorge its riches. But the parents will do not such thing, and the Provincial Government (which God prevent me from praising) has of necessity a saner view of costs than my distinguished colleague (whom God prevent me from naming). And even if society and government could be persuaded to devote yet more of its resources to the universities than they are (or as the University of Toronto would become if the *CUG Report* were implemented), would they be right to do so, given the present proof that we (all of us) don't know what we're doing ? ⁵

As already noted, the Commissioners, though more euphoric than I, faced the issue of divisiveness. The whole *Report*, in fact, is designed to make the University one, whole in spirit though multiple in limb. All the recommendations grow from their six "Principles of Community" : Trust, Openness, Academic Freedom, Pluralism, Participation, and Centralization and Devolution. To oppose these is to be as foolish as to favour pollution, and I have at times argued for each of them (with the exception of *openness*, which has a strange though popular odour). But are they sufficient, in the context of a modern university, to produce the desired effects ? What do the "principles" mean ?

What, for example, is meant by that simple and attractive word *trust* ? Does it imply that we all shall take one another's word for whatever is said ? An unlikely outcome of any structural change; perhaps, indeed, there has been too ready an acceptance of people's commitment to hasty words. Does it mean that we all shall (or that we shall not) count on people to go on behaving as they have behaved ? Does it mean that we shall all confidently rely on others to fulfill their duties and responsibilities ? Merely redefining duties and responsibilities is not likely to affect our trust, especially if impossible duties and responsibilities are assigned in a structural shakedown. When roles reflect abilities, trust is possible; when roles demand the impossible, respect and affection may remain, but trust will go. But perhaps, with Auden, the Commissioners are merely saying "We must love one another or die."

Openness may be valuable in some situations, but it is harmful and disruptive in others. As an overall cure for suspicion (which I suppose is the opposite of trust) I don't rate it very highly in the university.

⁵ Depressed by the faculty's performance in managing its and other's affairs, some professors suggest that students couldn't do any worse. Perhaps not, but increasing the handicaps is a strange way to improve the times.

We've got it at Toronto, and it hasn't produced trust, nor, I must admit, has it produced disaster : it hasn't produced anything but the need for a new student demand ("parity") to replace openness as a key to the trust fund. Some people perform well in public debate; others don't — but performances in any case aren't what we need. The cultists of openness (and sincerity) forget that in putting one eye to the keyhole, they generally close the other.

Academic freedom, the third principle of community, is surely a safe and sane ground. Yes, on full examination, and provided there is agreement about what it means. But unfortunately there is disagreement about its past and present existence, and those who believe that it has existed may have doubts that the CUG recommendations will ensure its continuance. To this well-examined problem let me add just two comments : to say that the individual faculty member should have the right to teach just what we wants to (a view I've heard from some colleagues, and which has received some support from the C.A.U.T.) is to deny professional and moral responsibility; and to say that a student *in a university as now understood* should be able to study just what he wants to is to run hard against psychological and financial fact. Presenting such slogans may give one a comfortable feeling of moral rectitude, but to defend them in an unexamined form is to invite awful heartache.

Much of the *Report* bears upon the fourth principle, *participation*, and in so far as the Commission's activities were a response to student and faculty demands, this is the central issue. The *Report*, recognizing that prescriptions for participation can't be applied to such a diverse population as that of the University, hedges on numbers (this is the major compromise), saying that each body will want to make its own decisions. But, though I say it reluctantly, the argument is disingenuous. The composition of the Commission itself (four voting students, four voting faculty, with the President as make-weight) prejudges the question, as does the composition of the Governing Council, the Programming Committee, the University-Wide Committee, and the provision for "up to" fifty percent student membership on councils and in departments. Throughout, the foolish political analogy awards a halo to equality.

As every teacher knows, "participation" in the learning and teaching process can't be forced and still remain living. As everyone who has given himself to administration knows, the sacrifice of time and energy is enormous, and the rewards are steadily diminishing. We have to keep clearly before us what the principal individual goals of people are :

if we do so, then we shouldn't be surprised or shocked that it is well-nigh impossible to get students to give the necessary time and energy to administration, *while they still remain students*. And if they cease being students (as many now do), their main qualifications would seem to be youth, innocence, and inexperience.

This brings me to a very painful point. Far too many of my colleagues have been telling me how impressed they are with students' abilities on committees; how bright they are; how nice they are. Is this news? Have they never known students? When students tell me how awful it was in the past on campus, I can at least say to them that they don't know what they're talking about — but to say that to my colleagues is a sad accusation. Of course students are capable, intelligent, and even pleasant — they always have been (after all, we were students once). And *some* of them could, with training, experience, and pay, be very good administrators indeed. So could *some* of us, if we gave our minds and careers to it. Our lives testify to social and individual priorities, however, and to the sacrifice of some goals for others.

I'm not denying the need for participation, and I'm not limiting participation to what has traditionally gone on in classroom, office, and laboratory. There is good reason to argue for felt influence, but to equate on the average individual students and individual faculty (whether or not this means parity) is to talk nonsense. I detect another disturbing element in those faculty members who support such an equation: a feeling of personal inadequacy, amounting often to guilt. I too feel inadequate, but when it gets to the point of thinking (as more than one sufferer has confessed of himself) that I have no business in recommending texts to students, let alone evaluating their work (and I evaluate work, not people), then I hope I have the courage to refuse to take pay on false pretences. If I'm no better at my job than a student would be, then I shouldn't hold that job. But one of the most degrading tricks an old dog can learn is to lie down and play dead.

The recommendations on the principle of *Centralization and Devolution*, though close to my own interests, and related to questions of pluralism, really bear more intimately on the particular problems of the University of Toronto than on the problems of universities in Canada generally, and so may be passed over, with a suggestion that a resolution here might make other resolutions unnecessary.

That leaves, of the stated principles, only *Pluralism*. The section on pluralism gives perhaps the most obvious evidence of the Commis-

sioners' loyalty to their University. In examining various implications of the term, they list two possible meanings that are pernicious :

it can mean that each sector in the university, because it is so different from all others in the problems it faces, must be allowed to administer its affairs autonomously; it can mean that each academic discipline (because it is so professionally specialized) must be allowed to define itself and the methodologies it employs without regard for the divisions it introduces into faculties and departments. In these senses, pluralism is an open invitation to a fragmented university with no overall character — a collection of fiefdoms. Such pluralism is actually a threat to individual freedom and to the concept of the "university community."

The alternative they offer is this :

a decentralized structure that permits the devolution of authority and responsibility from a Governing Council to subsidiary bodies, precisely so that policies made in the interest of the whole university can be implemented at lower levels in ways that respect real differences throughout the university. So, too, in matters academic — curriculum, appointments, teaching methods, areas of research, etc. — pluralism can mean that alternative ways of defining the discipline, exploring the subject matter of the discipline, organizing teaching and research, and recruiting new staff are both recognized and used (p. 10; 37-38).

Since little argument is devoted expressly to showing the dangers of the rejected meanings or the virtues of the accepted one, I confess to being but little impressed. The Commissioners were not naive, and so one must assume another major unstated compromise here — and an unworkable one. If autonomy is granted to the extent implied in the second sentence of the latter quotation, then I can't see how the first sentence can mean anything, or how the supposed dangers ("fiefdoms," "a threat to individual freedom") are avoided. Unless, that is, the Commissioners are willing to go even further than their recommendations concerning a college structure suggest (and there are contradictions here). As to "alternate ways of defining the discipline, exploring the subject matter of the discipline, organizing teaching and research, and recruiting new staff," how can there be such alternate ways unless there is more than one department in each subject area? And if so, can it really be thought that "policies made *in the interest of the whole university*" (by the Governing Council, remember) can be applied without limiting

choices? All right: a balance is called for — but that balance in my view ignores the genuine need for pluralism, the need that grows out of diverse attitudes to higher education, not just to different disciplines or methodologies. The university cannot, as a unit, serve all the gods in the current heavens. Students, even more than faculty, are bitterly divided about what they want and can expect from post-secondary education. Some want a “free university,” run by learners for learners, without regulations, restrictions, or degrees. Some want a highly structured education, geared to a known goal or goals, with reliable and recognized certification. Some want to tell others what to do; some want to be told what to do. Some want a limited, specialized training; others want a general introduction (and just that) to ideas, traditions, and trends. Some want a period of self-examination in semi-withdrawal from society; others want to learn by involvement in practical affairs, with or without a concomitant involvement in theory. Some want a quick trip to life stations; others want a permanent intellectual — or physical — “high.” And so on, with all gradations.

The *CUG Report* argues that only if its principles are accepted can the University of Toronto continue. It may (with some very large qualifications) be right. It also argues that if its principles are accepted, the University will flourish. I don't believe it. I don't believe, that is, that all the needs and longings can be satisfied within one community calling itself a university. There will be no resolution of our problems until post-secondary education is viewed more realistically by those engaged in it. Allowing for individual disappointments and failures, I believe that our society can afford to provide alternate avenues to maturity (some of them very inexpensive), avenues permitting individual examination of the past, the present, and the self — but there must be many places and many ways, not dependent one on another for community, yet each finding its place in a larger community.

We must look much more carefully at the possibilities for continuing and adult education, involving released-time study and combined work-and-learning. We may have to limit enrolment in certain institutions to those who have worked for a few years after leaving secondary school. We may have to encourage the development of practical projects as part of Social Science education. We probably will have to found new liberal arts colleges. We may have to combine some professional and technical programmes with those in Community Colleges. We may have to split off graduate schools from undergraduate institutions. We certainly have to reassess and restructure extension programmes. I believe that many

of these developments will occur, and occur within the next twenty years — and I fear that the universities will continue in either embattled or apathetic states throughout the changes, wondering why, in trying to develop “community,” they are losing contact with their communities.

Meanwhile, for us at Toronto, certain decisions have to be made. We should remember that while “traditional” attitudes and practices are not adequate to deal with all needs and desires, they are still very relevant in dealing with others about which “radicals” are woefully ignorant. One is laughed at for suggesting that because something has worked in the past, it should be continued; should not the laughter be louder when it is suggested that because something has worked in the past it should be discontinued? And we should all recall that the wisdom of Solomon was in offering a compromise that wasn’t acceptable to all parties. Was the mother wrong to refuse it?

DIRECTOR, REGISTRAR SYSTEMS & RECORDS

Environment: Simon Fraser University, an emerging institute of 5000 undergraduate and 500 graduate students in Arts, Science and Education, located in Vancouver, British Columbia and operating on the trimester system.

Responsibilities: Reporting directly to the Registrar, and in close cooperation with academic departments, to co-ordinate the long range design and implementation of new university procedures for pre-registration, timetabling and modern student record and retrieval systems.

Qualifications: A university degree; a minimum of 4 years specialization in systems and procedures, to include university registration and student record systems preferably in quarter or trimester systems; familiarity with the operational and planning requirements, academic and administrative, for student data and statistics; familiarity with modern optical data preparation, micro-filming, and E. D. P. systems and equipment.

Salary: \$12,000-17,000 and dependent entirely on qualifications.

Confidential enquiries and resumes should be directed to:

**Wm. B. McMinn,
Woods, Gordon & Co.,
MANAGEMENT CONSULTANTS,
2400 Oxford Tower, Edmonton, Alberta, Canada.
Phone (403) 429-7261**

LE CAS DE SOCIOLOGIE À L'UNIVERSITÉ DE MONCTON

Le rapport suivant fut soumis au comité de la liberté universitaire et de la permanence de l'emploi à sa réunion des 17 et 18 mai 1969.

C'est au début d'avril 1969 que l'Association des professeurs de l'Université de Moncton remet entre les mains de l'A.C.P.U. le cas de la section de Sociologie de cette université. Le 28 mars quatre membres de cette section sont informés, sans délai de préavis, que leurs contrats ne seraient pas renouvelés l'année suivante. Leur présent engagement se termine avec la fin de juin 1969. Les résultats de ce non-renouvellement sont de laisser la section de Sociologie sans corps enseignant puisque les deux autres membres avaient déjà pris des mesures définitives pour être en congé pendant l'année 1969-1970. L'association locale s'adresse à l'A.C.P.U. non seulement pour les quatre enseignants impliqués, mais également pour les étudiants inscrits à la maîtrise qui s'inquiètent de l'interruption de leur programme d'études.

Les professeurs Taschereau et Malloch rencontrent le président de l'association des professeurs de Moncton à Montréal le samedi 12 avril. Le jeudi 17, ils visitent le campus de l'Université de Moncton. Pendant leur séjour ils discutent de l'affaire avec le recteur de l'université, M^e Adé-
lard Savoie, avec le comité exécutif de l'association locale, avec les quatre enseignants en question, avec des représentants de l'association des étudiants et enfin avec les étudiants inscrits en Sociologie. Les paragraphes suivants résument les observations du comité Taschereau-Malloch sur les événements.

L'Université de Moncton fut créée il y a cinq années par la fusion des trois collèges francophones de la province du Nouveau-Brunswick sous la direction d'un campus central à Moncton. Dans les premières années, il y eut beaucoup de discussion au sujet de l'opportunité d'avoir un baccalauréat avec spécialisation dans certaines matières (quelque chose analogue au « Honours B.A. » des universités canadiennes anglophones) ou le baccalauréat général (avec une concentration) conduisant à la maîtrise dans la même matière. Il y a environ deux ans, le père Reno Desjardins, alors doyen de la Faculté des Arts et M. C. A. Richard, professeur de sociologie¹ consultèrent le département de Sociologie de l'Université Laval demandant leur avis sur les degrés à offrir. A Laval on leur conseilla d'introduire progressivement un programme sous-gradué dans la spécialisation, année par année. Puisque les deux collèges affiliés au campus central de Moncton ne possédaient pas les personnes compétentes

¹ Il semble que M. Even ait également participé à l'élaboration du programme de Sociologie.

pour enseigner cette matière, le père Desjardins et le professeur Richard entreprirent d'offrir à Moncton la maîtrise en Sociologie. Le programme de maîtrise offert uniquement au campus de Moncton, exigeait au moins deux années d'études. Tout étudiant qui avait complété son baccalauréat avec la mention Sociologie pouvait s'y inscrire. Cette motion fut soumise au Sénat de l'Université de Moncton par le père Desjardins et approuvée au printemps 1967. Dès la rentrée de l'année suivante 1967-68 le nouveau programme était offert et deux étudiants s'y inscrivaient. Pendant l'année [1968-1969] qui vient de s'écouler, un de ces deux candidats passa en deuxième année du programme et sept autres furent admis en première année.

L'enseignement du programme de Sociologie tant au niveau de la maîtrise qu'au niveau du baccalauréat est assuré pendant l'année courante par un personnel de six enseignants : deux adjoints et quatre chargés d'enseignement. Les quatre qui se sont vu refuser le renouvellement de leur contrat sont M. Even, chef de la section (*section*, puisque la sociologie, comme d'autres matières, ne jouit pas du statut de *département*), et MM. Denis, Hauteœur et Pagnotta. M. Even avait enseigné trois années consécutives à cette université et avait été promu de chargé d'enseignement au rang d'adjoint en juillet 1968. M. Hauteœur terminait sa deuxième année consécutive. MM. Denis et Pagnotta furent engagés à Moncton à l'automne 1968. Les deux autres membres de la section qui doivent prendre un congé d'études pour terminer leur doctorat à Laval sont les professeurs Richard et Ravault. Le premier enseigne à l'université depuis 1964 et fut promu au rang d'adjoint en 1965. Le second termine sa deuxième année d'enseignement à l'université. Pendant la présente année le professeur Even a soumis des projets pour la prochaine session : tôt dans l'année il a remis au doyen de l'École des Sciences Sociales un budget; en février avec l'approbation du père Reno Desjardins, présentement vice-recteur (académique), il avait prévu n'assumer que la moitié de sa charge d'enseignement afin de se consacrer à la rédaction de sa thèse de doctorat; et vers le milieu du mois de mars 1969, il avait reçu du doyen de l'École des Sciences Sociales un horaire de l'attribution des cours pour l'année 1969-1970 qu'il devait remplir et retourner. Sur cette feuille figuraient, en plus du nom du professeur Even, ceux de MM. Denis, Hauteœur et Pagnotta. Moins de deux semaines plus tard chacun reçoit une lettre du recteur l'avisant que son contrat ne sera pas renouvelé.

Le recteur cite quelques faits pour rendre compte de sa décision. Vers les mois de février et mars, il reçoit des rapports provenant d'étu-

dians et de membres du corps professoral de l'université qui l'amènent à questionner sérieusement la qualité du travail accompli dans le programme de maîtrise en Sociologie ainsi que la compétence des membres du corps professoral enseignant dans cette section. Le 17 mars 1969, il écrit à M. le doyen Yves Dubé, de la Faculté des Sciences Sociales de l'Université Laval lui demandant de comparer les deux programmes de maîtrise de Moncton et de Laval et de lui transmettre ses commentaires sur l'admissibilité d'un candidat de Moncton au programme de Sociologie de Laval. Il demande, d'ajouter des commentaires sur les qualifications des enseignants de la section de Sociologie de Moncton et de se prononcer sur d'autres questions connexes. Afin de faciliter la tâche à M. le doyen Dubé, il lui fait parvenir un *curriculum vitae* de chacun des enseignants concernés avec des extraits de l'annuaire de l'Université de Moncton décrivant le programme de Sociologie. Le 18 mars, le recteur envoie une lettre semblable à M. le doyen Philippe Garigue, de la Faculté des Sciences Sociales de l'Université de Montréal. M. le doyen Dubé, dans une longue réponse datée du 20 mars, établit une comparaison qui n'est pas favorable au programme de Moncton ni aux enseignants en question, mais s'abstient de faire des recommandations sur l'action à suivre. Dans sa réponse du 24 mars, M. le doyen Garigue fait également des comparaisons défavorables et recommande la cessation le plus tôt possible du programme de maîtrise de Moncton. Le recteur s'est dit profondément troublé par la lettre de M. le doyen Garigue, et, quelques jours après la réception de celle-ci, avisa par lettre les quatre membres de la section, déjà assignés à leurs fonctions pour 1969-1970, de l'échéance de leur contrat.

Les professeurs Taschereau et Malloch avertirent le recteur qu'ils trouvaient inéquitable pour les quatre enseignants la décision de les avertir de l'échéance de leur contrat avec si peu de préavis (même si le recteur agissait selon la lettre des règlements de l'université qui prévoient jusqu'au 1^{er} mai pour remettre un avis de non-renouvellement). Cette décision était également inéquitable pour les étudiants de ce programme qui constataient la disparition du corps enseignant sans que l'administration n'ait prévu de remplacement (bien que le recteur certifica qu'il avait entrepris de sérieux efforts pour trouver des remplaçants). Ils ajoutèrent que le recteur devrait songer à reprendre les quatre personnes pour la prochaine année afin de protéger les intérêts des étudiants et du corps enseignant et de s'allouer, à l'université et à lui-même, plus de temps pour procéder à une enquête en bonne et due forme sur toute la question de l'enseignement de la Sociologie à Moncton. Le secrétaire général de l'A.C.P.U. réitéra ses conseils dans une lettre adressée à

M. le recteur Savoie le 23 avril. On n'accusa pas réception de celle-ci et le 8 mai suivant, le secrétaire général dans une seconde lettre rappela à l'attention du recteur le contenu de sa première missive. Le professeur Taschereau fut averti par le président de l'association des professeurs de Moncton que l'opinion court sur le campus que le recteur attend la réunion du comité de la liberté universitaire et la permanence de l'emploi, fixée à Toronto le 16 mai, avant de remettre sa décision.

Ceci est un compte-rendu des principaux faits, compte tenu de la possibilité que les professeurs Taschereau et Malloch avaient de les vérifier. Il faut ajouter des circonstances aggravantes, telles que la relation entre les quatre enseignants et la contestation étudiante sur le campus pendant l'année, le pourcentage à Moncton de professeurs français, l'emploi comme enseignants de coopérants militaires français, l'insuffisance des octrois du gouvernement provincial pour l'Université de Moncton, etc.

A. Malloch

L.-P. Taschereau

15 mai 1969.

Remarques supplémentaires

Les membres du comité de la liberté universitaire et de la permanence de l'emploi de l'A.C.P.U. ont endossé les recommandations que les professeurs Taschereau et Malloch avaient faites au recteur Savoie lors de leur séjour à Moncton. Ses recommandations furent par la suite communiquées dans une lettre que le secrétaire général de l'A.C.P.U. écrivit au recteur de Moncton. Les recommandations du comité de la liberté universitaire de l'A.C.P.U. furent rejetées par le recteur Savoie et à la rentrée de l'automne 1969 le programme de la maîtrise en Sociologie avait à toutes fins utiles disparu. Les étudiants qui s'y étaient inscrits furent dirigés vers des programmes de maîtrise en d'autres disciplines ou vers des programmes de Sociologie offerts dans d'autres universités. Des quatre professeurs dont le contrat ne fut pas renouvelé, seul M. Even est rentré en France. MM. Denis et Hauteœur se sont inscrits à l'Université Laval pour continuer leurs études et M. Pagnotta, un coopérant français, fut réengagé pour une autre année à l'Université de Moncton (apparemment à la suite d'une intervention du gouvernement français). L'enseignement de la Sociologie au pré-gradué est assuré cette année par un nouveau professeur, M. Naidu, et M. Pagnotta.

4 mars 1970.

A. Malloch

L.-P. Taschereau

“CANADIANIZATION” AND THE UNIVERSITY

When the Association's Position Paper on “Canadianization” was published in the C.A.U.T. *Bulletin* (vol. 18, no. 1, October 1969) members and other interested persons were invited to send in their comments. The following are letters the Central Office has received on the position paper.

W.M.D.

Dear Sir :

I am sending you this comment in the hopes that you will bring some of these ideas to the attention of the Executive and Finance Committee.

The statement of June 27, 1969 on “Canadianization and the University” I find somewhat disturbing. In view of the C.A.U.T.'s stated policy in its guidelines on Academic freedom and tenure that there should be no discrimination in hiring and tenure based on nationality, a statement on “Canadianization” seems uncalled for. At best it is superfluous, at worst it is contradictory.

However the June 27th statement introduces a new definition of “competence” as a criterion for academic appointment. I do not believe that anyone would seriously argue that scholastic competence should not be the major factor to be considered in academic appointments and advancement. However when such criteria as “. . . familiarity with things Canadian . . .” are introduced into a judgement of competence, a different situation has arisen. The June 27th statement goes further. In the first paragraph, the Executive and Finance Committee of the C.A.U.T. seems to be promoting nationalism in the statement that faculty members at Canadian universities should be “. . . committed to the development and enrichment of the Canadian community . . .” I believe it goes without saying that there are a number of faculty members in Canadian universities who are quite opposed to nationalism and its various implications. These people are sometimes called “Internationalists.” They do not believe that nationalism and the results of nationalism are particularly desirable goals. I do not believe I have to spell out the details of the various anti-nationalistic philosophies to the Executive and Finance Committee. I would only ask if the June 27th statement could not be

construed by various persons to be an argument against the hiring and retention of such people. Is this really C.A.U.T.'s aim and desire?

The statement in the second paragraph relative to Department Heads in what are apparently "sensitive" positions I find particularly objectionable. The statement says that a Department Head "... (of History, for instance, or French, English, etc.) who is unsympathetic *or* indifferent to the development of Canadian studies is clearly incompetent..." According to this, several Department Heads that I know of must be considered incompetent by the Executive and Finance Committee because they are indifferent to Canadian Studies. This, again, could be construed by some people to mean that if the Head of a History Department for example, did not promote a Canadian Studies program at his University, he was incompetent. This is a concept that I cannot accept.

This attitude as represented in the June 27th statement, an attitude that is implicit and explicit throughout the statement of juvenile nationalism on a level compatible with what one finds in grade school textbooks, is not in keeping with the dignity that should be shown by a body representing the faculty members of Canadian universities. I hope therefore that the Executive and Finance Committee will seriously reconsider what is an obviously hastily drawn up document. I for one reject the document and I know other faculty and administration at Memorial who also reject the implications, particularly of the first two paragraphs, of the document.

Sincerely,
J. A. Tague,
President,
Memorial University of Newfoundland
Faculty Association.

Dear Dr. Berland,

In reply to your letter of December 3, I will try to explain some of the reasons for my objection to the attitudes of the C.A.U.T. concerning the de-Canadianization of our universities. My understanding of these attitudes is based on what I have read in the C.A.U.T. *Bulletin* of October, 1969.

On page 5 of the *Bulletin* appears the implication that in assessing two applicants of roughly equal competence for an academic appoint-

ment no relevance should be attached to Canadian citizenship. Since one of the applicants cannot be chosen on the basis of superior qualifications, one must then make a random selection. In this case, the C.A.U.T. prefers to flip a coin rather than select the Canadian. This particular statement and its implications I find insulting to the Canadian community. My analysis of the cause of this emotional reaction is given in the next paragraph. I believe the university has a primary role in the pursuit, maintenance, and transmission of knowledge. The C.A.U.T. is quick to oppose anything which would hamper the effectiveness of the university in this role. However, the university also has the role of serving the needs of the community in which it is established. It is supported by that community to educate its youth and enrich the lives of its citizens. I find that the C.A.U.T. while perhaps sympathetic to the communal relationships of the university is not eager to come to their defence. Indeed, consider a graduate student who is expecting his Ph.D., who has lived and been educated in the Canadian community, who has been subsidized by the community (through its support of tax deductions, etc.) in order to receive the intellectual training which will enable him to be of benefit to the community and who in applying educational institutions, government scholarships and fellowships, income for a job as a professor is considered of equal competence with a member of a foreign community. In such a case should the community benefit from its support of the student? Do the communal ties of individual and community have any meaning? Is the role of the university in preparing the citizens of the community for professional positions being subverted? Is the public being misled in its support of the university? The C.A.U.T. non-statement avoids these questions. I find that I cannot. If the university's primary role is not being compromised then I see no argument which logically excludes the consideration of community aspirations in faculty appointments.

My statement that C.A.U.T. policy is short-sighted refers to the policy statement on *Canadianization and the University*. This is not because of what the statement says but rather because of its failure to get to the root of the problem. The advertising of all academic vacancies in Canada is certainly desirable but will not be effective unless the hiring procedures are truly competitive. I suggest that an open committee of department members and student representatives screen all applications and that common agreement be reached by the committee on final selections for positions. When I refer to an open committee I refer to one in which no decision is made for confidential

reasons. These suggestions, mild as they are, go further than the recommendations of the C.A.U.T.

I also find that no mention was made in the C.A.U.T. statement concerning senior administrative positions. In considering such positions the internal control of public resources in the university, of university planning and development, of educational policies, and of community relations are all involved. One is no longer dealing with the individual excellence of a scholar but rather with who should exercise control within a public institution. The question of whether or not placing such control in the hands of a non-citizen constitutes an erosion of Canadian sovereignty must be faced.

Sincerely yours,
M. P. Closs,
Assistant Professor,
Department of Mathematics,
University of Ottawa.

Dear Sir :

The draft statement *Canadianization and the University* goes some way towards defining a difficult problem. I should like to point out, however, what seem to me to be some of its major shortcomings.

The C.A.U.T. believes that it is possible to oppose discrimination based on citizenship by opposing such discrimination within Canada alone. This is an illusion, which has its origin in the C.A.U.T.'s refusal to consider the academic market in Canada in an international context. When virtually every country of the world (including the U.S. and the U.K.) gives preference to its own citizens in granting permanent employment, even in many instances to the point of excluding foreign scholars by law, unwillingness on the part of Canadian universities to consider the citizenship of applicants clearly discriminates against Canadian scholars as a collectivity. The C.A.U.T. would have Canadian universities tell scholars who are Canadian citizens that they, unlike scholars of every other state, may not be given preference in their own country. Now that a very large proportion, possibly as many as two-thirds, of all applications received by Canadian universities are from foreign scholars of all levels of experience, this discrimination against Canadians which the C.A.U.T. is in effect supporting is very real and

of considerable consequence, particularly for young Canadian scholars just completing their graduate training.

The basic problem, therefore, is not whether or not there is to be discrimination within Canada, but rather what kind of discrimination is to be preferred. While any form of discrimination based on citizenship ought to be lawful, fair and equitable, I think everyone would agree that the ultimate criterion for making such a choice must be the public interest. The C.A.U.T. statement on Canadianization suggests the public interest will be best served if academic competence be taken as the only appropriate criterion for distinguishing between applicants for employment, even if the application of such a criterion involves discrimination (of the kind I have described) against Canadian citizens as a group. There is much to be said for this position. The employment of the most competent staff available is obviously in everyone's interest. Nor could it be cogently argued that the public has delegated to universities the power to select staff in order to enable members of the academic profession either to maintain a closed shop for their own benefit or to provide work for unemployed Canadian scholars. Nevertheless, if the C.A.U.T. draft policy were to be used as a guideline, then there would be other consequences which would not be in the public interest at all.

First, there is nothing in the C.A.U.T. statement which would have the effect of preventing Canadian citizens from becoming a small minority in Canadian university faculties. If this were to happen, then, insofar as our universities are internally democratic institutions, Canadian faculty — and through them the Canadian public — would lose control of such vitally important matters as curriculum, student admissions and the employment of new faculty. Such a development, the beginnings of which are already clearly discernible in certain departments and faculties, would be so strongly contrary to the public interest that it would invite direct government control of university affairs. The advertising of all new openings in Canada would undoubtedly help to ensure the continued existence of a quorum of Canadians, but it appears the C.A.U.T.'s perennial recommendation in support of advertising is still going unheeded in most quarters. Only a fraction of new openings, it should be noted, were advertised in the December issue of *Academic Vacancies*. If the C.A.U.T. were really serious in its desire for advertising, it would ask the provinces for legislation making it mandatory.

Secondly, the draft statement places the C.A.U.T. in opposition to any legislation which would enable universities to strive over the years

to employ enough Canadians of excellence to ensure that Canadians remain or become, say, a two thirds majority in each department. At a time when the majority of applications for employment are from non-Canadians, our present lack of policy in this regard renders impossible the reliable, long-term planning of academic manpower needs which the C.A.U.T. actually calls for elsewhere in the statement. Under the present circumstances, in fact, any such planning would be deceptive. Without a clear employment policy on the part of universities to complement planning, it is not unlikely that scholars will be brought to high qualification at considerable private and public expense only to join the ranks of the unemployed. This is actually happening now.

Thirdly, by opposing any measure which "would reduce or restrict the status or rights of non-Canadian faculty members," the Executive and Finance Committee is, in effect, resisting the proposal that legislation should be passed making Canadian citizenship a necessary qualification for all new appointments to administrative posts from chairmanship to chancellorship inclusive. Such legislation would be appropriate because academic administrators are the persons who are primarily responsible for exercising certain governmental powers which have been delegated to the universities by the state. Administrators decide who may or may not enter the academic profession in Canada. They exercise disciplinary and semi-judicial powers with respect to both students and faculty. They play a leading role in the making of rules and regulations which have the force of law. Persons who exercise such important administrative, judicial and law-making powers in a society ought at least to have the qualifications of a voter. By insisting on the "right" of foreign faculty to remain non-Canadian even while exercising such high authority within the community, the Executive and Finance Committee is by the same token challenging the fundamental, democratic, civil right of the Canadian community to be governed by its own members. This preference seems to me to be indefensible.

The C.A.U.T. statement appears to recognize implicitly some of these problems when it recommends that "competence" should be defined not only in terms of knowledge but also in terms of a university teacher's concern for knowledge having to do with Canada. The draft statement notes that "from this viewpoint, the Chairman of a department (of history, for instance, or French, English, etc.) who is unsympathetic or indifferent to the development of Canadian studies is clearly incompetent regardless of his academic qualifications, his citizenship, or national origin." The sentiment in this formulation is admirable, but I cannot

see how this criterion could ever be applied in practice. I know of no means whereby the "sympathy" or "concern" of the vast majority of scholars could be assessed. And even if it were possible to gauge sympathy or concern, the application of such a test would, I fear, restrict the academic freedom of university teachers to assess the importance and desirability of Canadian studies themselves. A scholar could not show lack of sympathy without running the risk of being declared incompetent. Furthermore — and this, I think, is the greatest weakness in the C.A.U.T. statement — there is reason for believing that such a formula could never be applied lawfully. I have been legally advised that if any person or institution were to declare a university teacher "incompetent" for reason of his being "unsympathetic or indifferent to the development of Canadian studies," the uttering of such a statement, *even if its substance were admitted to be true*, would provide firm grounds for a libel or slander action. Until such time, therefore, as the C.A.U.T. cares to bring a test case before the courts, it must acknowledge the fact that this criterion, which it has but tentatively recommended, will probably never be openly applied in Canada.

Thus there is really nothing in the C.A.U.T. statement which could provide an adequate basis for preventing Canadian universities from becoming predominately or entirely staffed either by non-Canadians or by university teachers who are indifferent or unsympathetic to the advancement of learning in relation to Canadian particularities. Accordingly, I request that the Council of the C.A.U.T. refer the draft statement back to the Executive and Finance Committee for further consideration.

The proposals which Professor Mathews and I have been putting forward may not offer the best way of dealing with the problem of de-Canadianization, but they do have certain merits which I hope the C.A.U.T. will consider. First, I can see no reason why there need be any lessening of faculty competence (as that word is ordinarily defined) if Canadian universities were to "strive to employ" a two-thirds majority of Canadians. We have never maintained that a less competent Canadian should be employed in preference to a more competent foreign scholar. For obvious pedagogical reasons, we have suggested, however, that a knowledge of Canada could be regarded as a useful qualification for a majority of scholars who are teaching Canadian students. Secondly, our proposals offer a workable criterion for assessing a scholar's concern for the Canadian fact : Canadian citizenship. This criterion is objective, even to the point of being legalistic. Its application would not restrict

academic freedom, and there is the added advantage that it could be applied lawfully.

Implementation of our proposals would provide an adequate basis for the continued existence of an academic community in Canada which is so sensitive and critically responsive to the needs of the Canadian community that direct government control of universities would never become a necessary evil. It is possible that Canadians themselves might one day decide that the Canadian fact is insignificant and ought to be forgotten. But that is a decision which only Canadians may make. Many lives have been sacrificed to establish and uphold this kind of fundamental democratic right.

Yours sincerely,
James Steele,
Associate Professor,
Department of English,
Carleton University.

AUT CONCESSIONS HANDBOOK

We wish to inform readers that the Association of University Teachers of Great Britain continues to extend to members of associations of university teachers in the Commonwealth visiting in Great Britain the concessions scheme available to AUT members. This consists mainly of various trading concessions, but also includes some insurance plans. AUT has prepared a special letter of introduction and a Concessions Handbook which are distributed on request to persons who can establish that they are members of C.A.U.T. C.A.U.T. members visiting the U.K. who wish to apply for this privilege should write, **after arrival**, the General Secretary, Association of University Teachers, Bremar House, Sale Place, London, W. 2.

The report of an independent commission of inquiry on forty Catholic Colleges and Universities in Canada has been published under the title, *A Commitment to Higher Education in Canada*. It is available at \$3.50 per copy from the

On annonce la parution de *Présence catholique dans l'enseignement supérieur au Canada*, le rapport d'une Commission spéciale d'enquête sur quarante universités et collèges catholiques du Canada. On peut se le procurer à \$3.50 l'exemplaire au

National Catholic Education Office
90 Parent Avenue, Ottawa 2, Ont.

CENTRAL OFFICE DIARY

CHRONIQUE DU SECRÉTARIAT

JANUARY - APRIL 1970 — JANVIER - AVRIL 1970

In response to a number of requests we are again publishing an abbreviated chronicle of the activities of members of the C.A.U.T. professional staff. It is one way of assisting members in understanding the work in which the Central Office is engaged.

E.J.M.

January - janvier

- 15 Associate Executive Secretary (Monahan) to Montreal for discussions with the Executive of the Loyola College Faculty Association.
- 16 Associate Executive Secretary (Monahan) to Toronto for a meeting of the Canadian Society for the Study of Higher Education.
- 16-17 Executive Secretary and Associate Executive Secretary (Dubé) to Montreal for a meeting of the C.A.U.T. Student-Staff Relations Committee.
- 16-17 Meeting in Central Office of the Committee on C.A.U.T. Relations.
- 18 C.A.U.T. President to Ottawa for meeting with Executive Secretary.
- 19 C.A.U.T. President, Executive Secretary, and Chairman of the A. F. & T. Committee in Ottawa for meeting with representatives of the A.U.C.C. on proposed A.U.C.C. *Guidelines on University Organization*.
- 22-23 Associate Executive Secretary (Monahan) to Toronto for meeting of the Board of Directors of the Canadian Commission for the Community College.
- 23-24 Executive Secretary to Toronto for meeting of the Academic Freedom and Tenure Committee.
- 30-31 Executive Secretary to Montreal for a press conference in connection with the release of the Report of the C.A.U.T. Committee of Enquiry into the Santhanam Case at Loyola College and for meetings with persons involved with affairs at Loyola College.

- 31 Associate Executive Secretary (Monahan) in Ottawa for meeting of the C.A.U.T. Committee on Professional Ethics.

February - février

- 5- 6 Professional Staff and members of the Executive in Ottawa for a regular meeting of the Executive and Finance Committee.
- 14 Executive Secretary to Queen's University for informal meetings.
- 16 Associate Executive Secretary (Dubé) to Moncton for a visit to the member association at Université de Moncton.
- 17 Associate Executive Secretary (Dubé) to Fredericton on visit to St. Thomas University in connection with an application for affiliation with the C.A.U.T. received from the Faculty Association of St. Thomas University.
- 17-18 Executive Secretary and another member of the A. F. & T. Committee to Sackville, New Brunswick for discussions with parties at Mount Allison University.
- 19 Associate Executive Secretary (Dubé) to Wolfville, Nova Scotia for visit to member association at Acadia University.
- 19-20 Executive Secretary, Associate Executive Secretary (Monahan), and two members of the Committee on C.A.U.T. Relations to Toronto for discussions with Executive of O.C.U.F.A.

March - mars

- 1- 4 Associate Executive Secretary (Monahan) in Chicago for annual conference of the American Association for Higher Education.
- 2 Executive Secretary in Saskatchewan for a visit to the member association at the University of Saskatchewan, Saskatoon.
- 3 Executive Secretary to Brandon for a visit to the member association at Brandon University.
- 4- 7 Executive Secretary to Winnipeg for visits to member associations at the University of Manitoba and the University of Winnipeg and for the annual general meeting of the Canadian National Commission for UNESCO.
- 10-11 Executive Secretary and Associate Executive Secretary (Dubé) to Montreal for a meeting of the C.A.U.T. Student-Staff Relations Committee.
- 13-14 Executive Secretary to Montreal for a meeting of the Academic Freedom and Tenure Committee.

- 19 Le secrétaire général adjoint (Dubé) et M. Gordin Kaplan, vice-président, se rendent à l'Université de Montréal pour rencontrer le Conseil d'administration de l'A.P.U.M.
- 20-21 Executive Secretary to Toronto for a meeting of the Awards Committee of the J. H. Stewart Reid Memorial Fellowship Trust.
- 23 Associate Executive Secretary (Dubé) to Thunder Bay for a visit to the member association at Lakehead University.
- 24 Associate Executive Secretary (Dubé) to Sudbury for a visit to the member association at Laurentian University.
- 25-26 Executive Secretary to Fredericton for a visit to the member association at the University of New Brunswick.

April - avril

- 2- 3 Professional Staff and members of the Executive to Toronto for a meeting of the Executive and Finance Committee.
- 4 Professional Staff and members of the Executive in Toronto for a Special Meeting of the C.A.U.T. Council.

WORLD UNIVERSITY SERVICE OF CANADA

ENTRAIDE UNIVERSITAIRE MONDIALE DU CANADA

WUSC is organizing this Summer, August 1970, a study seminar on **Education and Social Change** at the Centro Intercultural de Documentacion (CIDOC) in Cuernavaca, Mexico. Applications from interested faculty and students should be addressed to: WUSC, 328 Adelaide St. West, Toronto 133, Ontario, by April 15 or as soon thereafter as possible.

L'EUMC organise l'été prochain, août 1970, un séminaire de recherches sur l'**Éducation et les transformations sociales** au Centro Intercultural de Documentacion (CIDOC), Cuernavaca, Mexique. Les professeurs et les étudiants intéressés sont priés d'adresser toute demande à: EUMC (WUSC), 328 ouest, rue Adelaide, Toronto 133, Ontario, avant le 15 avril ou le plus tôt possible après.

REPORT ON SALARY INCREASES

When the Report on Salaries was prepared, (Bulletin, 18, 2 Winter 1970, pp. 51-67) we did not have time to present and analyze the increases in average salaries from the preceding year. Tables 1 and 2 below show these increases in dollars and in percentage terms for those universities for which the information is available.

The increases in average salaries shown here are not averages of salary increases received by individual faculty members. The change in average salaries is influenced by these individual increases, but it is also influenced by turnover - additions to and subtractions from the numbers at each rank at each university as a result of hirings, promotions, resignations, and retirements. Generally, the effect of turnover is to reduce average salaries, so that average increases to individuals must be larger than the increase in average salaries.

Table 3 summarizes the results for selected ranks and the overall average salary. The average increase in average salaries was about \$1,000, but for full professors it was \$1,500. However, at one quarter of the universities the increase in average salary for full professors was under \$1,000 and at one quarter of the institutions it was \$2,000 or more. In percentage terms, increases in average salaries averaged about 8 percent, although for individual ranks other than full professor the figure was lower. One quarter of the institutions had increases in average salary of less than 6 percent and one quarter had increases of 10 percent or more.

Table 4 shows that the current increases have had the effect of further increasing the well known regional disparities of academic salaries. On the average the increase in average salaries was lowest in the Atlantic region and highest in Ontario.

Between October 1968 and October 1969 the average hourly earnings of hourly-rated employees in manufacturing rose by 8.7 percent. At 21 of the 37 universities for which reports are available, the increase in average salaries was less than this amount.

R. Holmes

G. Rosenbluth

Table 1 - Increase in Average Salary by Rank, 1968-1969 to 1969-1970 (Dollars)

Institution	Full Professors		Associate Professors	Assistant Professors	Next Lower Rank	Overall Average
	Dept. Heads	Others				
	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$
Acadia	1 211	250	836	844	735	563
Dalhousie	1 531	1 450	1 371	606	1 941	1 378
Moncton	-	1 114	1 534	846	360	512
Mt. Allison	-	3 010	1 492	1 017	917	313
Mt. St. Vincent	0	-	369	545	989	679
St. Francis X.	-	-	752	826	385	399
St. Mary's	-	-	986	752	483	502
U. N. B.	1 147	904	983	1 205	539	1 077
Bishop's	1 921	825	1 263	856	417	1 160
McGill	1 461	1 196	792	745	576	1 013
Laval	1 892	1 376	662	1 023	309	839
Sherbrooke	645	482	1 150	790	1 123	694
Sir G. Williams	746	2 138	878	780	200	1 384
Brock	1 379	2 142	1 280	1 233	978	1 181
Carleton	1 276	1 441	920	767	689	1 117
Guelph	2 071	1 613	1 076	874	595	1 166
Lakehead	1 374	1 172	1 171	1 247	996	1 068
Laurentienne	1 163	-	1 085	862	983	1 007
McMaster	2 477	1 622	1 125	906	303	1 555
Ottawa	3 268	1 923	1 751	703	1 617	1 921
Queen's	3 005	1 900	1 415	896	1 287	884
R. M. C.	500	950	1 089	920	499	760
Trent	2 050	1 751	882	865	400	1 410
Waterloo	2 266	2 172	1 894	1 644	1 113	1 990
Waterloo Luth.	-200	672	97	597	43	639
Western	3 684	2 657	1 713	1 104	1 217	1 569
Windsor	1 492	1 165	1 064	702	416	1 051
York	397	1 490	1 123	680	817	1 014
Alberta	1 744	1 891	998	1 003	1 136	1 197
Brandon	1 200	1 367	1 100	423	607	601
Calgary	3 551	2 326	1 063	746	655	1 381
Lethbridge	981	686	933	920	945	1 194
Manitoba	1 470	1 169	775	585	116	787
Saskatchewan ^a	-8	646	404	691	248	761
U. B. C.	750	2 027	656	529	541	854
Victoria	1 719	1 502	894	645	-	989
Winnipeg	1 486	-	854	704	400	412

Source: Computed from Dominion Bureau of Statistics data

^a Including Medicine

Table 2 - Increase in Average Salary by Rank 1968-1969 to 1969-1970 (Percent)

Institution	Full Professors		Associate Professors	Assistant Professors	Next Lower Rank	Overall Average
	Dept. Heads	Others				
	%	%	%	%	%	%
Acadia	7.3	1.5	6.3	8.2	8.6	4.7
Dalhousie	8.0	8.2	10.2	5.4	21.2	10.5
Moncton	-	7.4	12.7	8.8	4.7	5.2
Mt. Allison	-	20.3	11.9	9.9	10.8	2.8
Mt. St. Vincent	0.0	-	3.2	5.9	13.9	7.4
St. Francis X.	-	-	5.6	7.8	4.5	3.5
St. Mary's	-	-	7.5	7.4	5.7	4.7
U. N. B.	6.5	5.5	7.7	12.3	6.3	9.5
Bishop's	11.4	5.2	9.8	8.4	4.9	9.7
McGill	7.2	6.4	5.4	6.5	6.2	7.3
Laval	10.6	8.1	4.6	8.7	3.4	6.4
Sherbrooke	3.0	2.7	7.9	6.6	12.2	5.3
Sir G. Williams	4.2	13.0	6.4	7.2	2.2	11.5
Brock	7.8	12.6	9.5	11.6	11.1	9.8
Carleton	7.0	8.1	6.8	7.1	7.9	8.8
Guelph	10.0	8.9	7.4	7.8	6.6	8.9
Lakehead	7.9	7.0	8.5	11.2	11.0	9.2
Laurentienne	6.6	-	7.9	8.0	11.2	8.8
McMaster	12.5	8.4	7.9	7.9	3.2	11.0
Ottawa	17.0	11.3	12.6	6.0	18.8	15.4
Queen's	13.7	10.2	9.8	7.7	13.2	6.0
R. M. C.	2.4	5.3	7.9	7.8	5.2	5.6
Trent	10.8	9.9	6.4	8.3	4.6	11.2
Waterloo	10.7	11.6	13.6	15.3	13.3	14.7
Waterloo Luth.	-1.1	4.0	0.7	5.6	0.5	5.5
Western	17.1	14.0	12.1	9.7	13.0	11.4
Windsor	8.4	6.7	7.4	6.0	4.3	7.8
York	2.0	7.9	8.0	6.0	9.1	8.1
Alberta	7.9	9.8	6.5	8.9	13.6	8.2
Brandon	7.4	8.7	8.5	4.0	7.4	5.1
Calgary	20.0	12.3	7.3	6.6	7.5	10.0
Lethbridge	5.3	3.6	6.3	8.1	10.8	9.3
Manitoba	7.4	6.6	5.6	5.3	1.3	6.0
Saskatchewan ^a	-0.04	3.5	2.8	6.2	4.6	6.0
U. B. C.	3.5	11.6	4.6	4.7	5.9	6.3
Victoria	8.8	8.7	6.4	5.9	-	8.3
Winnipeg	8.8	-	6.8	7.0	4.9	4.0

Source: Computed from Dominion Bureau of Statistics data

^a Including Medicine

Table 3 - Median and Quartile Increases in Average Salaries,
1968-1969 to 1969-1970

	Full Professors		Associate Professors	Assistant Professors	Overall Average
	Dept. Heads	Others			
	(\$ 000)				
Upper Quartile	2.0	1.9	1.2	0.9	1.2
Median	1.5	1.5	1.1	0.8	1.0
Lower Quartile	1.0	1.0	0.8	0.7	0.7
	(percent)				
Upper Quartile	10.7	10.7	9.0	8.8	9.9
Median	7.8	8.1	7.5	7.7	8.1
Lower Quartile	4.7	6.0	6.0	6.0	5.4

Source: Tables 1 and 2

Note: Half the figures in a category are higher or lower than the median, one quarter are higher than the upper quartile, and one quarter lower than the lower quartile.

Table 4 - Distribution of Universities by Percentage Increase in Overall Average Salary, and Region

$\frac{\%}{\text{Increase in Overall Average}}$ \ Region	Atlantic	Quebec	Ontario	Prairie & B.C.
less than 3%	1	0	0	0
3% - 6%	4	1	2	2
6% - 9%	1	2	6	5
9% - 12%	2	2	5	2
12% - 15%	0	0	1	0
15% - 18%	0	0	1	0
Median (%)	5.0	7.3	9.8	6.3

Source: Table 2

ADDENDUM

The following letter was received from the Faculty Association of Dalhousie University, with the request that it be published along with the information on current faculty salaries.

E.J.M.

February 12, 1970.

The Editor,
C.A.U.T. *Bulletin*,
C.A.U.T. Central Office,
233 Gilmour Street,
Ottawa 4, Ontario.

Dear Sir :

We would like to point out to C.A.U.T. members that the salary data for Dalhousie University, included in the "Report on Salaries" by the Economic Benefits Committee, which was published in the Winter 1970 issue of the C.A.U.T. *Bulletin*, while correct, is nevertheless, quite misleading.

During the latter part of 1969 the Nova Scotia Medical Services Insurance (MSI) started making payments to Dalhousie University for the services rendered by certain members of the Medical Faculty. This money is paid to the University and not to the individual, and the University is using the money to raise the salaries of the clinical staff of the medical school. The raises have been substantial enough to increase the Average Salary for **all** Ranks at Dalhousie by about \$1,000.

This method of making the MSI payment is probably a fair one from the point of view of the clinical medical staff, but unfortunately, it puts Dalhousie into the category of "Leading Universities Grade (b)" (Table 2, p. 58, C.A.U.T. *Bulletin*, Winter 1970). This is unfortunate because it is not true for Dalhousie Faculty outside of the clinical medical field.

In order to tell the whole truth we have tabulated below the salary figures given to us by Mr. D. H. McNeill (Vice-President, Administration) in September 1969. Recently, we have been assured that none of these figures have been altered by the MSI payments. These, therefore, give the true picture of the 1969-70 salary levels at Dalhousie University, *excluding* the clinical medical staff.

Average Salaries, 1969-70

	<i>Professors</i>	<i>Associates</i>	<i>Assistants</i>	<i>Lecturers</i>	<i>Total</i>
Arts and Science	17,450	13,488	10,885	8,620	13,140
Law	18,444	14,812	11,571	—	14,848
Dentistry	20,142	17,500	14,291	8,300	16,195
Health Professions	18,187	14,166	10,652	7,922	10,512
Medicine (pre-clinical)	22,210	15,630	12,250	10,547	15,403
TOTAL	18,592	14,011	11,147	8,957	13,499

Minimum Salaries, 1969-70

Dalhousie has this year refused to state salary floors, hence the following figures have been submitted as the actual minimum being paid to any full time faculty member at each rank in each faculty.

	<i>Professors</i>	<i>Associates</i>	<i>Assistants</i>	<i>Lecturers</i>	<i>Total</i>
Arts and Science	15,000	12,250	9,200	8,000	
Law	16,000	13,750	10,000	—	
Dentistry	18,000	17,000	11,000	8,300	
Health Professions	16,500	13,500	9,200	5,000	
Medicine (pre-clinical)	15,250	12,750	9,500	7,500	

Salary Distribution, 10th and 90th Percentiles

	<i>Percentile</i>	<i>Professors</i>	<i>Associates</i>	<i>Assistants</i>	<i>Lecturers</i>
Arts and Science	10	15,500	12,500	9,600	8,000
	90	23,000	14,500	12,000	9,000
Law	10	16,000	13,750	10,000	—
	90	19,750	16,000	12,250	—
Dentistry	10	18,000	17,000	11,000	8,300
	90	22,000	18,000	16,000	8,300
Health Professions	10	16,500	13,500	9,250	5,000
	90	21,500	15,000	12,000	9,500
Medicine (pre-clinical)	10	18,000	12,900	10,750	8,000
	90	* 31,000	19,000	12,760	12,750

Yours Sincerely,

K. T. Leffek,

President, Dalhousie Faculty Association.

R. L. Comeau,

Chairman of Salaries Committee,

Dalhousie Faculty Association.

* Combined salary — Dalhousie and Province of Nova Scotia.

TRAITEMENTS DU PERSONNEL LAÏC À TEMPS COMPLET DANS LES UNIVERSITÉS ET COLLÈGES DU CANADA, 1969-1970
(Ces chiffres excluent les traitements du personnel religieux rémunéré à un niveau inférieur à l'échelle)

Source: données recueillies par le Bureau fédéral de la statistique auprès des institutions

université	titulaires		tous les titulaires (1 + 2)		agrégés		adjoints		rang inférieur adjoint		rang inférieur au précédent		autres lycomps les professeurs invités		moyenne générale	
	directeurs de département		autres													
	(1)	\$	(2)	\$	(3)	\$	(4)	\$	(5)	\$	(6)	\$	(7)	\$	(8)	\$
Acadia University																
nombre	13		8		21		29		37		38				2	
minimum	-		-		-		-		-		-		-		-	
1er décile	15 960		15 510		15 510		12 935		10 150		7 520		-		-	
moyenne	17 696		16 550		17 259		14 039		11 179		9 295		17 950		12 651	
9e décile	20 470		..		18 950		15 270		12 390		11 000		..		-	
University of Alberta																
nombre	75		177		252		406		438		73		-		-	
minimum	19 100		18 600		18 600		13 800		10 300		7 750		-		-	
1er décile	20 535		18 985		19 190		14 175		10 800		8 000		-		-	
moyenne	23 922		21 184		22 000		16 336		12 293		9 482		7 440		15 735	
9e décile	27 008		23 964		25 737		18 505		13 600		11 420		..		-	
Bishop's University																
nombre	10		3		13		17		42		4		-		-	
minimum	16 400		16 400		16 400		12 900		10 100		8 200		-		-	
1er décile	17 200		..		16 640		12 900		10 100		-		-		-	
moyenne	18 830		16 650		18 327		14 119		10 993		9 000		..		13 133	
9e décile	20 150		..		20 150		16 330		12 030		..		-		-	
Brandon University																
nombre	6		3		9		24		39		11		3		-	
minimum	16 500		16 500		16 500		12 500		9 700		-		-		-	
1er décile		12 940		9 700		8 010		..		-	
moyenne	17 483		17 067		17 344		14 004		11 056		8 782		7 933		12 352	
9e décile		15 460		12 720		9 500		..		-	
University of British Columbia																
nombre	81		266		347		375		556		59		Instructor I		-	
minimum	15 800		15 800		15 800		11 700		9 500		7 800		101		-	
1er décile	16 910		16 800		16 800		12 500		10 100		8 000		7 500		-	
moyenne	22 142		19 484		20 102		14 886		11 794		9 717		9 359		14 449	
9e décile	25 690		22 440		23 748		17 200		13 600		12 000		12 290		-	

Brock University										
nombre	13	7	20	16	51	31	-	2	-	-
minimum	-	17 000	17 000	13 100	10 400	8 300	-	-	-	-
1er décile	17 180	-	17 000	13 100	11 000	9 020	-	-	-	-
moyenne	19 008	19 142	19 055	14 700	11 896	9 758	-	14 950	13 178	-
9e décile	21 050	..	21 500	16 700	13 280	10 790	-	..	-	-
University of Calgary										
nombre	23	76	99	219	246	21	-	-	-	-
minimum	-	18 600	18 600	13 800	10 300	7 750	-	-	-	-
1er décile	20 573	18 633	18 678	13 825	10 580	8 030	-	-	-	-
moyenne	23 323	21 173	21 673	15 716	12 036	9 423	-	-	15 131	-
9e décile	25 702	25 147	25 511	18 000	13 300	10 250	-	-	-	-
Carleton University										
nombre	17	54	71	133	194	18	-	-	-	-
minimum	-	16 700	16 700	12 600	10 000	-	-	-	-	-
1er décile	17 470	16 940	17 030	12 930	10 300	7 650	-	-	-	-
moyenne	19 429	19 191	19 248	14 543	11 511	9 441	-	-	13 834	-
9e décile	21 510	21 000	21 000	16 570	12 900	10 640	-	-	-	-
Dalhousie University										
nombre	30	77	107	92	167	50	-	-	-	-
minimum	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
1er décile	16 500	15 850	16 000	12 500	9 750	8 000	-	-	-	-
moyenne	20 617	19 145	19 558	14 811	11 761	11 103	-	-	14 476	-
9e décile	27 000	23 650	24 000	19 000	16 000	18 400	-	-	-	-
University of Guelph										
nombre	39	90	129	156	229	91	19	4	-	-
minimum	-	17 000	17 000	13 300	10 400	8 600	7 400	-	-	-
1er décile	19 972	17 340	17 340	13 900	10 711	8 667	7 400	-	-	-
moyenne	22 349	19 668	20 479	15 543	12 125	9 575	8 330	14 583	14 293	-
9e décile	24 603	21 897	23 246	17 167	13 625	10 612	9 550	..	-	-
Ecole des Hautes Etudes commerciales										
nombre	4	11	15	14	14	19	-	-	-	-
minimum	19 800	16 800	16 800	13 000	10 100	8 000	7 100	-	-	-
1er décile	..	16 800	16 800	13 280	10 100	8 000	-	-	-	-
moyenne	20 200	17 636	18 320	14 643	11 343	9 552	-	-	-	13 368
9e décile	..	18 800	20 400	15 660	13 220	11 420	-	-	-	-
Laurehead University										
nombre	10	5	15	35	64	52	9	-	-	-
minimum	-	17 300	17 300	13 500	10 650	8 850	7 455	-	-	-
1er décile	17 540	..	17 420	13 714	10 840	9 265	..	-	-	-
moyenne	18 663	17 972	18 433	14 889	12 396	10 052	7 595	-	12 706	-
9e décile	19 780	..	19 580	16 405	15 082	10 940	..	-	-	-

SALARIES OF FULL-TIME TEACHING STAFF AT CANADIAN UNIVERSITIES AND COLLEGES, 1969-1970
(Salaries paid to religious staff on a scale less than that applying to lay staff are omitted)

Source: From data supplied to the Dominion Bureau of Statistics by the institutions

University	Full professors						Overall average			
	Department heads, etc. who are full professors (1)	Other full professors (2)		ALL full professors (total of 1 & 2) (3)			The rank immediately below assistant professor (6)		The rank immediately below the preceding (7)	
	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$
Laurentian University										
Number in rank	13	5	18			25	25		6	1
Floor	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
10th percentile	16 747	18 875	17 160	13 388	10 500	8 665	8 665	-	-	-
Average	18 717	18 875	18 761	14 754	11 587	9 729	9 729	-	8 117	-
90th percentile	20 325	20 325	20 675	16 550	12 690	10 765	10 765	-	-	12 513
Laval University										
Number in rank	56	157	213	215	375	180	180	-	-	26
Floor	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
10th percentile	15 428	15 671	15 433	12 687	10 500	7 275	7 275	-	-	-
Average	19 816	18 336	18 725	14 987	12 722	9 316	9 316	-	10 940	-
90th percentile	24 800	20 086	20 937	18 000	15 463	10 900	10 900	-	14 817	-
University of Lethbridge										
Number in rank	7	10	17	29	67	11	11	-	-	-
Floor	-	18 600	-	13 800	10 300	7 750	7 750	-	-	-
10th percentile	-	18 600	17 340	13 800	10 800	9 000	9 000	-	-	-
Average	19 581	19 736	19 472	15 689	12 284	9 714	9 714	-	-	-
90th percentile	-	22 475	22 475	18 007	13 750	10 250	10 250	-	13 988	-
University of Manitoba										
Number in rank	61	92	153	277	333	120	120	-	-	-
Floor	-	16 500	16 500	12 500	9 700	-	-	-	-	-
10th percentile	17 622	16 620	16 830	12 970	10 000	7 500	7 500	-	-	-
Average	21 353	18 954	19 911	14 564	11 674	9 258	9 258	-	13 667	-
90th percentile	25 240	22 480	23 800	16 500	13 070	10 900	10 900	-	-	-
McGill University										
Number in rank	70	188	258	352	421	126	126	-	-	-
Floor	-	16 820	16 820	13 140	10 100	8 400	8 400	-	-	-
10th percentile	16 000	16 820	16 820	13 140	10 100	8 400	8 400	-	-	-
Average	21 830	19 831	20 373	15 354	12 224	9 842	9 842	-	14 845	-
90th percentile	26 500	23 920	24 920	18 000	15 000	11 228	11 228	-	-	-

McMaster University										
Number in rank	24	84	108	132	147	28	3	-	-	-
Floor	-	16 500	16 500	13 000	10 250	7 500	-	-	-	-
10th percentile	17 710	16 518	16 920	13 756	10 610	8 500	-	-	-	-
Average	22 298	20 825	21 153	12 387	12 387	9 669	..	-	15 718	-
90th percentile	27 300	26 453	26 502	17 075	13 800	11 180	..	-	-	-
Memorial University										
Number in rank	24	28	52	79	<u>Lecturers</u> 186	<u>Instructors</u> 117	6	-	-	-
Floor	16 500	16 500	16 500	13 000	10 000	7 400	6 000	-	-	-
10th percentile	16 500	16 500	16 500	13 000	10 000	7 500	..	-	-	-
Average	21 229	18 062	19 524	14 261	11 277	8 870	7 667	..	-	12 135
90th percentile	30 000	19 600	30 000	15 500	12 910	10 000	..	-	-	-
University of Moncton										
Number in rank	-	6	6	22	71	45	-	-	-	-
Floor	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
10th percentile	-	12 120	9 400	7 000	-	-	-	-
Average	-	16 100	16 100	13 575	10 439	7 980	-	-	10 545	-
90th percentile	-	15 280	12 450	9 000	-	-	-	-
Université de Montréal (excluant médecine)										
Number in rank	22	100	122	186	248	123	24	-	-	-
Floor	17 550	16 800	16 800	13 350	10 200	8 200	6 600	-	-	-
10th percentile	17 880	16 800	16 800	13 350	10 200	8 200	7 020	-	-	-
Average	20 176	19 036	19 241	14 419	11 668	9 611	7 460	-	13 523	-
90th percentile	21 640	21 000	21 380	16 365	13 230	10 900	7 800	-	-	-
Mount Allison University										
Number in rank	-	21	21	18	38	26	-	-	-	-
Floor	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
10th percentile	-	16 620	16 620	13 000	10 080	8 460	-	-	-	-
Average	-	17 838	17 838	14 005	11 337	9 400	-	-	12 640	-
90th percentile	-	19 910	19 910	15 620	12 420	10 200	-	-	-	-
Mount Saint Vincent University										
Number in rank	3	-	3	7	16	19	9	-	-	-
Floor	15 000	15 000	15 000	11 000	9 000	-	-	-	-	-
10th percentile	..	-	9 000	7 166	..	-	-	-
Average	16 667	-	16 667	11 786	9 730	8 097	6 616	-	9 794	-
90th percentile	..	-	10 146	9 500	..	-	-	-
University of New Brunswick										
Number in rank	20	33	53	92	154	47	19	-	-	-
Floor	15 200	15 200	15 200	12 000	9 000	7 000	-	-	-	-
10th percentile	16 700	15 360	15 500	12 100	9 680	7 420	5 360	-	-	-
Average	18 810	17 224	17 822	13 739	10 983	9 129	6 863	-	12 446	-
90th percentile	22 500	19 910	19 910	14 900	12 300	11 160	8 290	-	-	-

TRAITEMENTS DU PERSONNEL LAÏC À TEMPS COMPLET DANS LES UNIVERSITÉS ET COLLÈGES DU CANADA, 1969-1970
(ces chiffres excluent les traitements du personnel religieux rémunéré à un niveau inférieur à l'échelle)

Source: données recueillies par le Bureau fédéral de la statistique auprès des institutions

	titulaires		tous les titulaires		agréés		adjoints		rang inférieur adjoint		rang inférieur au précédent		autres (y compris les professeurs invités)		moyenne générale	
	directeurs de département	autres	(1 + 2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)	(12)	(13)	(14)	(15)
	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$
Notre Dame University of Nelson																
nombre	-	1	1	1	10	13	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
minimum	-	12 793	12 793	12 793	10 535	8 278	-	6 773	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
1er décile	-	10 535	8 278	-	6 773	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
moyenne	-	11 481	9 285	-	7 417	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	9 713
9e décile	-	13 000	11 411	-	9 323	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Nova Scotia Technical College																
nombre	7	3	10	10	14	34	7	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
minimum	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
1er décile	14 000	14 000	12 200	10 000	..	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
moyenne	16 322	15 917	16 200	16 200	13 643	11 493	8 429	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	12 695
9e décile	18 250	18 250	15 000	13 000	..	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Université d'Ottawa																
nombre	38	56	94	94	145	228	108	3	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
minimum	15 700	15 700	15 700	15 700	12 560	9 550	7 540	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
1er décile	19 234	15 700	16 679	16 679	13 605	10 500	8 259	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
moyenne	22 509	19 007	20 482	20 482	15 683	12 447	10 219	8 767	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	14 389
9e décile	27 000	22 532	24 349	24 349	18 127	14 902	13 050	..	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
University of Prince Edward Island																
nombre	5	3	8	8	31	39	31	9	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
minimum	-	16 000	16 000	16 000	13 500	10 500	8 500	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
1er décile	13 500	10 500	8 500	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
moyenne	17 528	17 528	14 205	11 392	9 236	9 100	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	11 892
9e décile	16 045	13 000	10 000	..	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Queen's University																
nombre	40	118	158	158	200	249	45	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
minimum	-	17 200	17 200	17 200	13 500	10 300	9 500	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
1er décile	19 600	17 880	17 880	17 880	13 700	10 590	9 500	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
moyenne	24 925	20 318	21 634	21 634	15 788	12 461	11 095	..	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	15 857
9e décile	31 500	23 560	25 820	25 820	17 900	15 000	14 500	..	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

Royal Military College									
nombre	7	11	18	19	15	27	-	-	-
minimum	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
1er décile	-	16 085	17 360	13 785	11 775	8 910	-	-	-
moyenne	21 571	18 718	19 828	14 945	12 690	10 128	-	-	14 367
9e décile	-	20 450	23 100	16 500	13 350	10 740	-	-	-
St. Francis Xavier University									
nombre	8	9	17	25	58	39	9	-	-
minimum	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
1er décile	-	16 250	16 250	12 850	10 150	8 350	-	-	-
moyenne	-	-	16 495	12 850	10 150	8 350	-	-	-
9e décile	-	-	17 862	14 246	11 432	7 111	-	-	11 713
St. Mary's University									
nombre	1	5	6	28	53	48	1	-	-
minimum	15 500	15 000	15 000	12 000	-	-	-	-	-
1er décile	-	-	-	12 300	9 700	8 000	-	-	-
moyenne	-	-	-	14 046	10 862	8 923	-	-	11 194
9e décile	-	-	-	16 700	12 410	10 060	-	-	-
St. Thomas University									
nombre	-	4	4	5	18	8	-	-	-
minimum	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
1er décile	-	-	-	-	8 512	-	-	-	-
moyenne	-	-	16 478	12 864	10 180	7 981	-	-	10 781
9e décile	-	-	-	-	11 543	-	-	-	-
University of Saskatchewan (incl. medical staffs)									
nombre	67	75	142	298	351	103	86	11	-
minimum	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
1er décile	17 795	17 400	17 450	13 400	10 500	8 260	7 400	8 710	-
moyenne	19 688	18 915	19 280	14 858	11 906	9 725	8 334	12 496	13 485
9e décile	21 700	20 625	21 480	16 700	13 300	10 570	9 280	17 015	-
University of Saskatchewan (excl. medical staffs)									
nombre	63	71	134	288	339	102	82	11	-
minimum	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
1er décile	17 655	17 360	17 450	13 400	10 500	8 240	7 400	8 710	-
moyenne	19 598	18 919	19 238	14 859	11 918	9 730	8 343	12 496	13 503
9e décile	21 610	20 885	21 350	16 660	13 300	10 560	9 360	17 015	-
Université de Sherbrooke									
nombre	18	13	31	96	151	54	change de niveau	-	-
minimum	14 695	14 195	14 195	11 175	9 220	7 100	-	-	-
1er décile	19 480	16 108	17 195	13 417	10 372	8 796	7 585	-	-
moyenne	22 172	18 348	20 565	15 781	12 805	9 519	9 519	13 875	-
9e décile	25 980	23 100	24 560	18 000	15 560	12 116	11 553	-	-

SALARIES OF FULL-TIME TEACHING STAFF AT CANADIAN UNIVERSITIES AND COLLEGES, 1969-1970
(Salaries paid to religious staff on a scale less than that applying to lay staff are omitted)

Source: From data supplied to the Dominion Bureau of Statistics by the institutions

University	Full professors										Overall average	
	All full professors										Including deans (9)	Excluding deans (10)
	Department heads, etc. who are full professors (1)	Other full professors (2)	Associate professors (3 & 4)		Assistant professors (5)	The rank immediately below assistant professor (6)	The rank immediately below the preceding (7)	Others (including visiting staff) (8)				
	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	
Simon Fraser University												
Number in rank	10	36	46	63	177	Lecturer	Instructor	-	-	-	-	
Floor	-	15 800	15 800	11 700	9 500	-	54	-	-	-	-	
10th percentile	..	16 449	16 779	12 632	10 800	..	7 800	-	-	-	-	
Average	21 942	19 335	19 902	14 367	11 879	..	8 725	-	-	-	-	
90th percentile	..	22 200	23 200	16 510	12 865	..	9 908	-	13 200	-	-	
							11 570	-	-	-	-	
Sir George Williams University												
Number in rank	18	24	42	97	146	Lecturer	Sessional Lecturer	15	-	-	-	
Floor	17 500	16 500	16 500	13 500	10 000	8 500	7 500	-	-	-	-	
10th percentile	..	16 500	16 500	13 500	10 400	8 500	-	..	-	-	-	
Average	18 611	18 615	18 613	14 540	11 544	9 311	-	11 987	13 461	-	-	
90th percentile	..	21 700	20 500	15 990	12 740	10 360	-	..	-	-	-	
University of Toronto												
Number in rank	77	383	460	476	497	181	60	133	-	-	-	
Floor	16 500	16 500	16 500	12 300	10 000	8 200	-	-	-	-	-	
10th percentile	20 000	17 658	17 825	13 200	10 800	8 600	6 300	8 000	-	-	-	
Average	25 751	21 736	22 408	15 950	13 043	10 093	-	14 249	15 966	-	-	
90th percentile	31 800	27 200	28 000	19 100	15 750	11 850	10 745	17 650	-	-	-	
Trent University												
Number in rank	12	11	23	26	55	6	-	-	-	-	-	
Floor	-	17 200	17 200	13 100	10 100	8 000	-	-	-	-	-	
10th percentile	18 100	17 500	17 560	13 100	10 100	..	-	-	-	-	-	
Average	21 042	19 368	20 241	14 575	11 234	9 050	-	-	14 040	-	-	
90th percentile	26 600	25 550	25 700	16 190	12 450	..	-	-	-	-	-	
University of Trinity College												
Number in rank	7	8	15	8	13	Lecturer	Instructor	-	-	-	-	
Floor	17 000	16 500	16 500	12 300	10 000	8 200	-	-	-	-	-	
10th percentile	..	17 000	17 000	10 150	8 669	-	-	-	-	
Average	19 900	17 725	18 740	14 506	10 869	9 183	..	-	14 114	-	-	
90th percentile	21 400	..	12 000	-	-	-	-	

University of Victoria (B.C.)									
							Senior Lecturer		Lecturer
							2	7	
Number in rank	14	28	42	82	153	7			31
Floor	16 500	15 500	15 500	12 200	9 500	-			-
10th percentile	18 130	17 120	17 350	12 860	10 450	-		8 010	-
Average	21 219	18 713	19 548	14 935	11 622	-		9 439	7 000
90th percentile	23 910	20 405	22 888	16 780	12 857	-		11 600	10 966
Victoria University (Ont.)								10 640	16 470
Number in rank	7	23	30	22	31	4			-
Floor	-	15 800	15 800	11 700	9 500	-			-
10th percentile	-	15 890	16 100	11 700	9 500	-			-
Average	19 093	18 309	18 491	13 068	10 227	-			-
90th percentile	-	20 410	19 500	14 290	11 180	-			-
University of Waterloo									10 050
Number in rank	21	118	139	184	182				-
Floor	17 800	17 200	17 200	13 500	10 400	-			-
10th percentile	19 354	17 700	17 763	14 000	11 000	-			-
Average	23 431	20 890	21 874	15 817	12 424	-			-
90th percentile	26 930	25 900	26 000	17 500	13 567	-			-
Waterloo Lutheran University									15 542
Number in rank	4	10	14	33	53	2			-
Floor	-	16 800	16 800	12 900	10 000	-			-
10th percentile	-	16 800	16 800	12 900	10 000	-			-
Average	18 300	17 800	17 943	14 095	11 155	-		7 775	-
90th percentile	-	18 800	18 800	15 000	12 400	-		9 795	-
University of Western Ontario									12 136
Number in rank	40	117	157	203	276	29			-
Floor	16 800	16 800	16 800	12 700	10 500	-			-
10th percentile	21 339	18 210	18 755	13 190	10 500	-			-
Average	25 192	21 688	22 581	15 823	12 495	-			-
90th percentile	29 500	26 380	27 470	18 650	15 100	-			-
University of Windsor									15 365
Number in rank	25	43	68	123	137	40			-
Floor	-	17 000	17 000	14 000	10 500	-			-
10th percentile	17 232	17 245	17 252	14 000	10 955	-			-
Average	19 287	18 548	18 819	15 432	12 386	-			-
90th percentile	21 700	19 895	20 170	17 235	14 000	-			-
University of Winnipeg									14 466
Number in rank	6	2	8	23	51	7			-
Floor	-	16 500	16 500	12 500	9 700	-			-
10th percentile	-	-	-	12 500	9 710	-			-
Average	18 300	-	-	13 500	10 819	-			-
90th percentile	-	-	-	14 735	12 030	-			-
York University									10 663
Number in rank	22	83	105	98	208	25			-
Floor	-	16 400	16 400	12 200	10 000	-			-
10th percentile	17 000	16 460	16 812	13 000	10 500	-			-
Average	19 479	20 319	20 143	15 101	11 978	-			-
90th percentile	22 440	25 935	25 000	17 500	13 500	-			-

BOOK REVIEWS — NOTES DE LECTURE ACADEMIC FREEDOM AND ACADEMIC ANARCHY

Sidney Hook
New York, Cowles Book Company Inc., 1970

(Don Mills, Ontario, General Publishing Company Limited)

While the subject matter is topical and certainly important, this is not one of Sidney Hook's better books. It exhibits the forthright, argumentative style that marks his writing; but it is very uneven and shows evidence of having been composed in haste and it lacks the thoroughness in analysis that students of Hook have come to admire in his philosophical works. In short, it is not a balanced scholarly work, but perhaps it was not meant to be. During the past several years, Professor Hook, now in retirement, has concerned himself with the growing unrest on American university campuses. He has played a major part in founding the University Centers for Rational Alternatives, local faculty groups who have organized to provide some counterweight to the New Left on campus. This book, some of whose chapters are reprints of articles that have appeared earlier, is an outgrowth of this concern.¹

Professor Hook begins with the blunt judgment that the basic transformations in curriculum and organization now taking place in the contemporary American colleges and universities are intended, "not to foster the genuine educational growth of students but primarily to meet the challenge and threats of student unrest and disruption." (Preface, ix) "The stormy years of student uprising have resulted in both a failure of nerve and an eclipse of intelligence among many of those who have traditionally been entrusted with the guidance of our educational enterprise." (Preface, xi) With such an argumentative beginning readers can expect a controversial volume. They will not be disappointed.

Hook does not dispute the existence of student malaise; but he stoutly maintains that there is no evidence to show that this malaise is the result of the students' unsatisfied legitimate demands for curricular and organizational reform in the American university. A number of readers, especially among the more reform-minded, are likely to put

¹ The Appendices appear to have been included to add bulk. The first, *Second Thoughts on Berkeley* was originally published almost five years ago and is reproduced here with only the addition of a short introductory paragraph. The second, reprinted from the *Saturday Review* of April 9, 1969, contains nothing not present in the preceding pages. The third deals with events at the University of Colorado in 1967 and 1968 affecting the SDS and has little value beyond its illustrating what most of us now know about the philosophy and tactics of the members of that revolutionary group. This section apparently escaped the careful eye of the proof-reader and contains numerous typographical errors.

the book down at this point convinced that Professor Hook has no contribution to make to any meaningful discussion about the future of the contemporary university. But they will be mistaken. Professor Hook is not Ronald Reagan or Spiro Agnew, though on occasion his rhetoric has a startlingly similar sound; he is a distinguished academic with a long career as a liberal reformer and as such deserves careful attention even when one may disagree both with his analysis of the problems and with the proffered solutions.

Hook contends, wrongly I think, that many of us are today almost totally distracted by efforts to seek answers to the question, "What must be done to end disruption and threats of violence in the academic community?" when instead we ought to be addressing ourselves to the basic question of what is the best education for modern man and woman. He argues that it has been naively assumed that the answer to the former question constitutes an answer to the latter, when at best it is but a necessary condition to an adequate answer. Surely Hook is correct in this last judgment; but the judgment about "a naive assumption" seems to be only a reflection of his unwillingness to acknowledge the possibility that persons who have reacted very differently to campus disruption and violence than has Hook himself have done so not because they are naive but because they have a more comprehensive (I almost said better) answer to the basic question of what sort of education is best for today's students than does Hook. One does not have to agree with their answers, however, to grant that they are less than naive. Having met quite a few academics, both faculty and administrators, who are deeply concerned over campus problems, I have yet to meet one who has made the naive assumption that the basic problem is simply one of how to end the disruptions.

As the title indicates, the heart of Hook's book involves his discussion of academic freedom: freedom for faculty (*Lehrfreiheit*), and freedom for students (*Lernfreiheit*). The analysis of these notions is rather short and on balance not very satisfactory, more because of what is left unsaid than for what is said. We are presented with an abbreviated summary of the traditional concepts of academic freedom for faculty and students within the context of the traditional university. On the whole I think this analysis is good as far as it goes. However, we are not given an adequate analysis of the meaning of academic freedom in the changed conditions of the contemporary university. It may be that Professor Hook would have us re-make the contemporary university, transforming it back into what it was (or was supposed to be)

and that my basic disagreement with his analysis lies with my rejection of both the practicality and the desirability of doing this.

Professor Hook describes academic freedom for faculty (*Lehrfreiheit*) as, "the freedom of professionally qualified persons to inquire, discover, publish, and teach the truth as they see it in the field of their competence." (p. 34) Academic freedom is not a human right or even a civil right; it is one that must be *earned*. Once earned, however, and the granting of tenure is an indication of the fact that an individual has earned it, academic freedom "carries with it the *right to heresy* as well as the right to restate and defend the traditional views" (p. 36). Here Hook is re-stating the thesis he developed earlier, during his days as supporter of those who would drive the Communists from the academy, in his book, *Heresy, Yes — Conspiracy, No*, in which he distinguishes between heresy, which is to be protected by academic freedom, and conspiracy — any deliberate act that is contrary to the canons of professional ethics and integrity, which is not. Academic freedom, once earned and when properly exercised, ought to be subject to no control or authority save that of the rational methods by which truths or conclusions are sought and established in the various academic disciplines. The right of faculty to academic freedom and the viability of this right need to be guarded zealously, not only by the members of the academic community themselves, but also by the general community, "which ultimately is the source of the general means of its operation." (*ibid.*)

All of this is good, as far as it goes; but does it go far enough? Professor Hook is persuaded that, "Viewed in historical perspective, it is no exaggeration to say that never was *Lehrfreiheit* — the freedom to teach — in a healthier state than it is today." (p. 42) Even if one were to agree with him, some additional comments seem to be in order. For instance, the academic freedom to teach is not yet in as healthy a state as it ought to be, as the experiences of numbers of junior (non-tenured) faculty in our universities can well attest. The problems of non-tenured members of faculty, who now constitute a very large proportion of the professoriate, are not even alluded to by Hook. It is clear that Hook considers the present campus unrest as a threat to academic freedom, as some of it is; but his own interest seems too narrowly focussed on the need to protect the position of those few who have "earned" this right and he fails to show sufficient concern for the others.

Professor Hook recognizes the relation between tenure and academic freedom and judges the present system of tenure as "the least objection-

able of those that are at all practicable." Nonetheless, he has grave reservations about the system. He would like to see its operation improved substantially through a system of "periodic reviews of professional competence and a sterner desire to retire those who are unfit or misfit, even if it became necessary to pay them not to teach." (p. 38) Quite rightly, he points out that those who suffer most from the abuses of the present tenure system are students and he faults, again quite rightly, the members of the guild for being loath to admit this publicly. Yet Professor Hook seems unable properly to emphasize that it is an administrative responsibility to see that professorial incompetence and irresponsibility are dealt with in proper fashion, and that, for example, the alcoholic professor (Hook's own illustration) deserves to be afforded not the dubious help of colleagues who use his tenured position to "protect" him but access to an adequate health insurance plan that will make financially possible the treatment of his illness at the same time that his other financial obligations are met without causing undue suffering in the academic community.

On the larger and more important issues Professor Hook very properly emphasizes that many of today's student radicals (and some of their faculty supporters as well) have no genuine understanding of academic freedom and lack any real respect for it. Moreover, he is right to underscore the point that many of those faculty and administrators who have supported the demands of student radicals for university reform have failed to repudiate the coercive methods employed by the radicals to achieve their ends or to express the judgment that such methods constitute a grave threat to the well-being of the academic community. Hook is right also to insist that persons should be held responsible for their actions, even though one may disagree on the matter of whether this responsibility always implies the levying of heavy sanctions.

But, it seems to me, Professor Hook is wrong in his judgments about the significance of the causes of the unrest, and wrong in a singularly unhelpful way. He is very critical of those published reports on campus unrest that attribute it to unsolved problems in the larger society — war, racism, poverty, unemployment, etc. These problems, says Hook, were much worse in the 1930s, 40s, and 50s, and there was no extensive student unrest during that time. To assess the cause of the present unrest in terms of such external social, political and economic conditions, says Hook, is a "fatal weakness." He goes even further and criticizes what he terms as "the systematic underplaying of the subjective factor" in the contemporary student unrest and judges

that this underplaying "testifies to the residual strength of the outmoded 19th century deterministic beliefs that social forces, not men, make history." (p. 78) Surely, this conclusion is arguable. There are many reasons why today's students, unlike those of an earlier generation, are restless in the face of massive injustice. Perhaps they have been educated differently; one hesitates to say better. Moreover, is it not Professor Hook who is being the deterministic when he implies that, since social and economic conditions are better today than they were in the recent past, disruptions and violence, if objectively based, should be less frequent than they were in the past when conditions were worse? Is it too far-fetched to suggest (I merely suggest) that today's generation of students, better educated and more socially concerned, are less willing to put up with the things (we) their predecessors were? If this is the case, we should be grateful for their concern, without in any way supporting or even condoning some of their admittedly wrong ways of demonstrating this concern. For we must recognize, as Hook stresses, that violence degrades not only its victims but the entire educational process. But we must also recognize that the massive student support the radicals are able frequently to muster reflects genuine concern for real problems.

The best, certainly the most provocative chapter in the book is Chapter 7, entitled *The Barbarism of Virtue: The War Against the University*, a reprint of a paper Hook originally delivered before the Modern Language Association of America. In it he critically examines some of the "novel-sounding set of doctrines about the nature of the university and its vocation in a time of troubles" and really comes to grips with the contemporary New Left opponents of the uncommitted university and of value-free scholarship, not always with happy results. Professor Hook succeeds in outlining the basic shortcomings of Marcuse's concept of "repressive tolerance," with its fundamental totalitarian antipathy towards political democracy and personal freedom. He properly scores the irony of the present situation in which the attackers of academic freedom are able to mount their campaigns while they themselves enjoy the very freedom they would deny others. He is, however, not on as solid ground when he asserts that this "protection is made possible only because the university as a corporate entity is *not* committed to a political goal or does not act on its commitment, to the extent that unhappily it is still politically committed." (p. 157)

Unfortunately, Professor Hook then proceeds to undercut his own position. After stating that it should be obvious that the preservation of academic freedom depends on the survival of the free society of which

it is a part, he asserts that, "the university may justifiably sponsor research in areas of military defense if its staff is willing and qualified to undertake it, and the nature of the research project does not interfere with its strictly educational functions, especially intellectual freedom." (p. 161)

As long as the defenders of academic freedom in our universities are prepared to go to such absurd limits in defense of it, they should not be surprised that it remains under attack. With friends like this, other supporters of academic freedom can expect to continue to have enemies to face. As a proponent of the "uncommitted university," on the grounds that an apolitical institutional stance is a pre-requisite to maintaining academic freedom, Professor Hook argues that "in a rational and humane society there must be some activities and institutions that are beyond politics. Our world, our politics, our lives will be the better for it." (p. 181) I agree with this; but I wonder why Hook does not apply the principle in a more consistent fashion. Surely, we who would defend academic freedom against its opponents must face the fact that our universities as they are presently operating do *not* reflect an acceptable meaning of academic freedom in contemporary society and that a significant part of the opposition to the ideals of academic freedom is related to this regrettable fact.

While preparing this review I chanced upon yet another article dealing with to-day's student unrest. Speaking of the current efforts at educational reform, many of which are foundering, this author pessimistically comments, "Where there is rage and distrust, education is not possible." I entirely agree with this judgment and I am sure that Professor Hook does too. My question is, how much of what Hook is saying continues to contribute to this rage and distrust? Too much, I fear.

Edward J. Monahan.

NOTICE OF POSITIONS VACANT * ANNONCE DES POSTES VACANTS *

UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA. Centre for the Study of Mental Retardation — Research Personnel. The Centre for the Study of Mental Retardation is developing an interdisciplinary research programme with primary focus on mentally retarded children. Research personnel with demonstrated competence in the Behavioral and Social Sciences, Education, or the Bio-Medical Sciences, are invited to apply for staff positions. Successful applicants may receive full or part-time research appointments. For persons with suitable qualifications and interests, affiliation with an appropriate academic department may be arranged.

The Centre is also seeking a *Director*. Cooperating disciplines may include Neurology, Pediatrics, Psychiatry, Biochemistry, Genetics, Psychology, Sociology, Special Education, and Educational Psychology. The Centre is sponsored jointly by the University of Alberta and the Canadian Association for the Mentally Retarded. Individuals interested in this position must hold the terminal degree in their field of specialization, have considerable research experience and potential for research in the area of mental retardation, and be capable of directing the development of a major centre for study in this area. On the basis of appropriate qualifications and interests, affiliation of the Director with one of the academic departments may be arranged. Preference will be given to applicants whose qualifications permit appointment at the level of Associate or Full Professor. However, applications at all levels are invited.

The range of academic salaries for 1969-70 is as follows: Assistant Professors: \$10,300 to \$13,750; Associate Professors: \$13,800 to \$18,550; and Full Professors: \$18,600 upward. The position of Director will be open July 1, 1970, but the effective date of appointment will be determined by the availability of the successful candidate. Prospective candidates are invited to correspond with the undersigned. Applicants for the position of Director are requested to submit a *curriculum vitae*. Dr. D. R. Cameron, Director, Centre for the Study of Mental Retardation, Office 751A, Education Building, University of Alberta, Edmonton, Alberta.

* Institutions are charged for announcements of *Positions Vacant* at the rate of 75¢ per line or fraction thereof, with a minimum of \$3 per notice. Notices should be sent to the Editor, *C.A.U.T. Bulletin*, 233 Gilmour St., Suite 700, Ottawa 4, Ontario.

* Le taux de l'annonce des postes vacants est fixé à soixante-quinze cents par ligne ou fraction de ligne; le prix minimal est de trois dollars. Veuillez adresser toute annonce au directeur du *Bulletin de l'A.C.P.U.*, 233, rue Gilmour, bureau 700, Ottawa 4, Ontario.

BISHOP'S UNIVERSITY. Department of Business Administration. Assistant or Associate Professor in Finance — Ph.D. or D.B.A. to offer advanced undergraduate courses in Financial Management and Investment Management. Apply to : Professor D. C. Patridge, Acting Head, Department of Business Administration, Bishop's University, Lennoxville, P.Q.

Department of Political Science. Lecturer or Assistant Professor — Ph.D. to offer advanced undergraduate courses in two of the areas of Canadian, American and International Relations. Apply to Professor E. A. Prince, Head, Department of Political Science, Bishop's University, Lennoxville, P.Q.

Department of Psychology. Assistant Professor — Ph.D. to offer advanced undergraduate courses in Personality, Behaviour Pathology, and Principles of Testing. Apply to: Professor D. D. Smith, Head, Department of Psychology.

Department of Sociology. (a) Senior Assistant or junior Associate Professor and potential Department Head — Ph.D. and experience to develop relatively new Department. (b) Lecturer or Assistant Professor — Ph.D. Both to teach at undergraduate level, courses open. Salary floors (1969-70): Lecturer, \$8,200; Asst. Prof., \$10,100; Assoc. Prof., \$12,900. All applications should include *curriculum vitae* and names of three referees.

UNIVERSITY OF BRITISH COLUMBIA. Department of Pharmacology. Applications are invited for an appointment as Assistant or Associate Professor. The applicant will be expected to be trained in, or have a major interest in, the discipline of Pharmacology and preferably should possess an M.D. and Ph.D. degree. Duties will include teaching of Pharmacology to undergraduate medical and dental students, as well as graduate teaching to Science and Clinical Science students. Preference will be given to candidates who have investigative interests in both Clinical and Basic Science. The position is tenable from July 1, 1970. All applications must be accompanied with a *curriculum vitae* and names of three referees. For further details write : Dr. James G. Foulks, Head, Department of Pharmacology, Faculty of Medicine, University of British Columbia, Vancouver 8, Canada.

UNIVERSITY OF GUELPH. Department of Psychology. Applications are invited for Associate or Assistant Professors (2 positions) in Social Psychology and Verbal Learning. Appointment to commence July or September, 1970. Duties would include teaching undergraduate and/or

graduate courses, and development of own research. Address enquiries to : Dr. H. W. Kirby, Acting Chairman, Department of Psychology, University of Guelph, Guelph, Ontario.

Applications are also invited for the position of *Professor and Chairman of the Department of Psychology*. This position is for an established scholar who will provide leadership for a department with 25 members. As professor, he would have tenure. As chairman, he would serve for 5 years with the possibility of renewal. The Department has a fully developed undergraduate programme (general and honours degree) and an M.A. programme, and is developing a Ph.D. programme. Duties commence in 1970 or 1971. Salary open. Closing date for applications April 30, 1970. Applications with *curriculum vitae* and the names of three referees to : Dean M. H. M. MacKinnon, University of Guelph, Guelph, Ontario.

UNIVERSITY OF LETHBRIDGE. Department of Mathematics. Applications are being invited for the position of Assistant or Associate Professor in the fields of Statistics and Probability. The appointee will be expected to develop an undergraduate programme within the Department in these areas, teach undergraduates and engage in scholarly work. The salary will be dependent upon qualifications and experience within the range \$11,000 — \$17,000. The usual benefits regarding pensions, removal allowances, medical and group insurance are available. The effective date of appointment will be July 1, 1970. The University was established in 1967 and is located in Lethbridge, a city of 40,000. Applicants who are interested in such a challenge should address a *curriculum vitae* or any enquiries to L. G. Hoye, Chairman, University of Lethbridge, Lethbridge, Alberta.

Department of Music. Opening for an experienced Professor of Theory/Traditional Composition, commencing July 1, 1970. Salary and rank commensurate with experience and professional standing. Terminal degree desirable. Teaching competence in an additional area an advantage. Apply (stating age, and names of three referees) to : Lucien Needham, Chairman, Department of Music, The University of Lethbridge, Lethbridge, Alberta.

LOYOLA COLLEGE. Vice-President (Academic): Loyola College invites applications from candidates for the post of Vice-President (Academic). The Vice-President (Academic) is the senior Vice-President of Loyola College.

Dean of the Faculty of Arts. Loyola College is currently considering candidates for the post of Dean of the Faculty of Arts, and invites applications. The Faculty of Arts is the largest faculty at Loyola. Persons interested in being considered for appointment to one of these posts should write to: The Very Reverend Patrick G. Malone, S.J., President, Loyola College, 7141 Sherbrooke Street West, Montreal 262, Que.

McGILL UNIVERSITY. Department of French. Applications are invited for faculty appointments as Assistant, Associate or Full Professor, effective September, 1970, in the following fields: French-Canadian literature, 16th Century French Literature; 18th Century French Literature; Linguistics and Philology; new trends in literary criticism. The Department has 46 faculty members, Honours and Major programmes and offers work leading to M.A. and Ph.D. Rank and salary based upon qualifications. Moving allowances. Applicants should hold the Ph.D. and submit their application (*curriculum vitae* and list of publications) as soon as possible to Professor G.-P. Collet, Chairman.

Department of Zoology. Applications are invited for appointment of an Assistant Professor. Undergraduate teaching load approximately one full course. Minimum salary, starting September 1, 1970, of \$10,650. Preference will be given to applicants who can develop a research programme in (1) Comparative Endocrinology and/or Reproductive Biology, (2) Behaviour, (3) Evolutionary Theory. The Department of Zoology has a staff of 19 teaching chiefly in the areas of Ecology, Behaviour, Marine Biology, Comparative Physiology and Cell Biology. There are 43 graduate students registered in the Department for M.Sc. and Ph.D. degrees. Applications, together with *curriculum vitae*, publications list and the names of two referees should be sent to: Dr. J. Marsden, Chairman, Department of Zoology, McGill University, Montreal, P.Q., Canada.

MEMORIAL UNIVERSITY OF NEWFOUNDLAND. Department of Geography. The Department requires 1. Urban Geographer preferably with experience in quantitative methods. 2. Climatologist-Biogeographer. Appointments to be made at Lecturer or Assistant Professor level, depending on experience and qualifications. Apply: The Head, Department of Geography, Memorial University of Newfoundland, St. John's, Newfoundland, Canada.

UNIVERSITY OF NEW BRUNSWICK. Department of Economics, Chairmanship. Applications are invited from candidates with suitable academic backgrounds for the post of Chairman of a department that

currently has ten members. Rank and salary open to negotiation. The teaching load will be such as to permit research. Address applications to : Dean W. S. MacNutt, Faculty of Arts, University of New Brunswick, Fredericton, New Brunswick, Canada. Deadline for receipt of applications : May 1, 1970.

Department of Psychology. Assistant or Associate Professors. 1. To teach Comparative Psychology at undergraduate and graduate levels. 2. Specialist in Experimental Psychopathology. Write Chairman, Department of Psychology, University of New Brunswick, Fredericton, N.B.

UNIVERSITY OF NEW BRUNSWICK. Department of Sociology and Anthropology. Applications are invited for appointment beginning September 1970. Ph.D. or near Ph.D. desired. Preferred field is Social Anthropology with some competence in Archaeology, but other areas may be considered. Competitive salary and fringe benefits. Write : Chairman, Department of Sociology and Anthropology, University of New Brunswick, Fredericton, N.B., Canada.

UNIVERSITÉ D'OTTAWA. Faculté de Philosophie — Poste de Doyen. Qualifications : Philosophe compétent, capable de l'administration d'une Faculté bilingue (Anglais-Français) composée de 34 professeurs de formations diverses. Salaire : selon expérience et compétence. Entrée en fonctions : si possible le 1^{er} juillet 1970, au plus tard le 1^{er} juillet 1971. La Faculté de Philosophie, outre son programme d'études conduisant au baccalauréat, à la maîtrise et au doctorat, auquel sont présentement inscrits 160 étudiants, est responsable de l'enseignement de la philosophie dans les Facultés suivantes : Arts, Sciences, Sciences Sociales, Éducation et Éducation physique. La Faculté dispose d'une excellente bibliothèque de philosophie qui, en raison de certains secteurs spécialisés, est une des meilleures du continent nord-américain. Les personnes qui désirent de plus amples renseignements sont priées d'écrire au Doyen des Études supérieures, Université d'Ottawa, Canada. Les candidatures seront reçues avant le 1^{er} mai à la même adresse.

UNIVERSITY OF OTTAWA. Faculty of Philosophy. Applications will be received for the position of Dean from competent philosophers capable of the direction of a bilingual (French-English) Faculty of 34 staff of different backgrounds. Salary according to experience and qualifications. The applicant should be able to take up duties at the earliest July 1, 1970, and at the latest July 1, 1971. In addition to its own programme of studies leading to the bachelor, master and doctoral degrees in Philosophy, in which 160 students are presently engaged, the Faculty

of Philosophy is responsible for the teaching of philosophy in the following faculties and schools : Arts, Science, Social Sciences, Education and Physical Education. The Faculty has an excellent library which in certain specialized fields is among the best in North America. Applications and requests for further information should be addressed to the Dean of Graduate Studies, University of Ottawa, Ottawa 2, Canada.

Computer Science Department. The Faculty of Science and Engineering invites applications for a Chairman of the Computer Science Department. The present Computer Science Programme equally stresses the software and hardware aspects of the field. It is hoped to maintain this balance through joint appointments of majority of the staff to foster a multi-disciplinary approach. The University Computing Center (separate from the Department) provides 360/65 facilities. Interested applicants should write to Dean of Science, University of Ottawa, Ottawa 2, Ontario, Canada.

Department of Mechanical Engineering. Positions available in Canada's capital in different fields of Mechanical Engineering. Ph.D. degree or outstanding professional qualifications required. Salary and rank dependent upon experience. Preference will be given to candidates with experience in problems related to Arctic environment. Apply : Dr. Adolph Feingold, Chairman, Mechanical Engineering Department, University of Ottawa, Ottawa, Ontario.

LE COLLÈGE SAINTE-ANNE aura besoin pour septembre 1970 1) d'un professeur de mathématiques, bilingue, possédant un B.Sc. en mathématiques (minimum); 2) d'un professeur de physique bilingue possédant une maîtrise en physique (M.Sc. minimum); 3) d'un professeur de chimie possédant une maîtrise en chimie (M.Sc. minimum) et 4) d'un professeur d'histoire bilingue et possédant une maîtrise (M.A. histoire). L'enseignement dépendra des qualifications et de l'expérience. Faire parvenir toute demande avec un *curriculum vitae* au Recteur, Collège Sainte-Anne, Church Point, Nouvelle-Écosse.

SAINT MARY'S UNIVERSITY. Department of Psychology. Applications are invited for the following posts : Associate/Assistant Professors in Psychology. Positions are available in a new but expanding Psychology Department. Candidates should have, or be about to receive, a Ph.D. degree in any field of psychology, and will be expected to take up their position on September 1, 1970. Successful candidates will teach two courses, each of three hours per week, and have the responsibility for associated laboratories. At least one appointment will be in the

area of Clinical Psychology. Salaries will be competitive, and commensurate with experience. The usual staff benefits will be provided, as also will assistance towards travel to Halifax. Further details are available from the Chairman, Department of Psychology, Saint Mary's University, Halifax, Nova Scotia, Canada, to whom applications, including *curriculum vitae* and the names and addresses of three referees, should be sent as soon as possible.

UNIVERSITY OF SASKATCHEWAN. Department of Art. Senior Art Historian required. Ph.D. and teaching experience desirable. Duties : teaching, development of Art History programme, administrative responsibilities. Appointment at Associate Professor level from \$14,000 — depending upon qualifications, with good opportunity for advancement. Appointment effective July 1, 1970. Applications to Professor E. Bornstein, Head, Department of Art, University of Saskatchewan, Saskatoon.

Department of Geography. Assistant Professor, Ph.D., Biogeographer/Ecosystems Analyst. Apply to Dr. J. Howard Richards, Department Head, University of Saskatchewan, Saskatoon. Appointment July 1, 1970. Also two Visiting Lecturers or Assistant Professors (1 year appointments) with Ph.D. or near Ph.D. Various specializations.

UNIVERSITY OF SASKATCHEWAN REGINA CAMPUS. Department of Extension. Applications are invited for the position of Head of the Division of Liberal Studies. The primary responsibility of this post is to plan, develop and coordinate a wide range of continuing education programmes in the liberal arts. Depending upon applicant, position may be established as a joint appointment with Division of Social Sciences involving some teaching in undergraduate programmes. Require Ph.D. or M.A. in one of the social sciences preferably with specialization in social science methodology. Initial appointment will be made at Assistant Professor level with salary up to \$13,900 and usual faculty benefits. Enquiries addressed to : Director, Department of Extension, University of Saskatchewan Regina Campus, Regina, Saskatchewan.

UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO. Institute for Aerospace Studies. The Institute has a vacancy effective July 1, 1970, or earlier in the field of Aerodynamic Noise at the Assistant or Associate Professor level. Candidates should have a Ph.D. with strength in both experimental and theoretical aspects of the field. Duties would include teaching and research (with supervision of graduate students) to complement the existing programme on jet noise and sonic boom. Applications should be

sent to H. S. Ribner, Institute for Aerospace Studies, University of Toronto. A *curriculum vitae*, detailing background and publications, should be included. Letters of reference are desirable but not essential, and material will be held in confidence if requested.

TRENT UNIVERSITY. Department of Physics. Applications are invited for a senior appointment in the Physics Department. Research interests should be in the general area of the theory of physical and chemical bonding, to relate to research in the Department on imperfections in crystalline solids and mechanisms of surface adsorption. Salary minimum for Associate Professor in 1969-70 is \$13,100. Apply : Professor J. I. Lodge, Chairman, Physics Department, Trent University, Peterborough, Ontario.

Department of Chemistry. The Department is seeking to appoint a senior physical chemist in order to strengthen research and teaching at both undergraduate and graduate levels. A strong interest in teaching and an established reputation as an independent research investigator are essential. Preference will be given to candidates whose research interests are related to those already represented in the Department. The Department of Chemistry occupies a new, well-equipped building which is presently shared with the Department of Physics. A four-year Honours programme is offered with possibilities of a specialization in Organic, Inorganic and Physical Chemistry and also in Biochemistry. In addition, an M.Sc. programme (appraised by the Ontario Council on Graduate Studies) is in progress. The Department's next objective is to build sufficient strength to offer a Ph.D. programme. In common with all new graduate programmes in universities in the Province of Ontario, such a Ph.D. programme would be subject to appraisal by the Ontario Council on Graduate Studies. Due to these and other external factors it is impossible to predict with accuracy the exact date at which such an appraisal programme might be started. Until such time as the University is able to offer its own Ph.D. programme possible arrangements are being explored to enable senior members of faculty with established research reputations to engage in the supervision of Ph.D. students in collaborative programmes with other universities in the province.

UNIVERSITY OF VICTORIA. Vice-President for Academic Affairs. Applications are invited for Vice-President for Academic Affairs. Career position, reporting to the President. The Vice-President provides leadership and advises the President on all matters pertaining to academic planning and research programmes. In co-operation with the President, he presents to and interprets for the Senate and Board of Governors

recommendations concerning curricula, research, and related programmes; academic appointments, promotions, and tenure; and budget proposals for academic programmes. He makes recommendations concerning operations, staffing, budget, space needs, and development, of the Library, Computing Centre, and Counselling Centre. A candidate should have administrative experience in Canadian universities and must be qualified as a teacher and scholar. Please reply in confidence to the President, University of Victoria, Victoria, B.C.

Vice-President for Administration. Applications are invited for this career position, reporting to the President. Responsible for directing and co-ordinating the administrative service functions of the University, including staffing, budget, operations, the development of the administrative offices, and negotiations with Unions and employees. In discharging these responsibilities the Vice-President will develop and maintain close working relationships with the Vice-President for Academic Affairs, Deans, Heads of Departments and the Secretary to the Board of Governors. Candidates should have administrative experience in Canadian universities, and be qualified to assume broad responsibility and a leadership role. Please reply in confidence to the President, University of Victoria, Victoria, B.C.

Department of Chemistry — Chemistry for Poets. The appointee will develop courses for upper-level, non-science majors dealing with the science of Chemistry in modern society from historical, philosophical and experimental points of view. To be considered, applicants should have a Ph.D. degree, actual academic experience or formal qualifications in this area. Appointment at the Assistant Professor level is contemplated. Forward applications with *curriculum vitae* and names of three referees to : Dr. S. A. Ryce, Head, Department of Chemistry (R3), University of Victoria, Victoria, B.C., Canada.

UNIVERSITY OF WATERLOO. Department of Electrical Engineering. The Department is hoping to make several appointments for September 1970 in some or all of the following areas : active networks, communication systems, communication and/or control theory, computer-hardware, electromagnetic phenomena in devices (low and high frequency), electronic and integrated circuits. Please address your applications, with a detailed *curriculum vitae*, to : Dr. P. R. Bryant, Chairman, Department of Electrical Engineering, University of Waterloo, Waterloo, Ontario.

UNIVERSITY OF WESTERN ONTARIO. Faculty of Engineering Science — Director, Environmental Engineering Programme. The Fa-

culty of Engineering Science invites applications from persons experienced in Environmental Pollution, preferably air, and with administrative ability to direct and further develop the present Environmental Engineering Programme. The successful applicant would be expected to be active in research and teaching. Salary and rank are open. Applications should be addressed to : Professor W. H. Davis, Secretary of Faculty, Faculty of Engineering Science, University of Western Ontario, London 72, Ontario.

Faculty of Engineering — Electrostatics. The Faculty invites applications for an academic appointment in Electrical Engineering. The applicant should be an electrical engineer, preferably with a Ph.D. degree who has industrial experience. He would be expected to teach courses at the undergraduate and graduate level and his research interest should be in Electrostatics. Salary and rank are open. Applications should be addressed to : Professor I. Inculet, Chairman, Electrical Engineering Group, Faculty of Engineering Science, The University of Western Ontario, London 72, Ontario.

Department of Mathematics. Experienced Algebraists, preferably with research interests in Ring Theory, are invited to apply for a position with the rank of Associate Professor or Professor. Present salary minima for these ranks are \$12,700 and \$16,800. Applications, including *curriculum vitae* and the names of three referees, should be sent to Dr. D. Borwein, Head, Department of Mathematics, The University of Western Ontario, London 72, Ontario.

Faculty of Music. Applications are invited for a number of positions at the rank of Associate Professor, Assistant Professor or Lecturer. Teaching areas include undergraduate and graduate courses in Musicology, Theory and Composition, keyboard Harmony, Music Education string specialist, Music Education vocal specialist, elementary school clarinet and voice. Salary is commensurate with experience. Applications should be addressed to : Mr. C. von Kuster, Dean, Faculty of Music, The University of Western Ontario, London 72, Ontario.

Department of Physiology — Chairman. Applications are invited for Chairman of the Department. The person would undertake the usual duties of a departmental chairman in a department with 16 on its academic staff, an active M.Sc. and Ph.D. programme. He would also have teaching responsibilities in the Faculties of Medicine, Science, Dentistry and Graduate Studies. Salary and rank are open. The position would be effective July 1, 1970. Deadline for applications is immediate.

Curriculum vitae, list of publications and two references should be sent to : Dr. Douglas Bocking, Dean, Faculty of Medicine, The University of Western Ontario, London 72, Ontario.

Department of Zoology. Assistant Professor with Ph.D. or equivalent to teach an undergraduate course in Invertebrate Zoology. Research interest is open. Salary not less than \$10,500 which is floor for Assistant Professor rank. Inquiries should be sent to : The Chairman, Department of Zoology, University of Western Ontario, London, Ontario, by the 15th of April, 1970. Date of appointment July 1, 1970.

UNIVERSITY OF WINDSOR. Department of English. Applications are invited for an appointment at a senior level. Renaissance or Shakespeare specialty would be attractive. Rank and salary commensurate with qualifications. Address : Dr. Roderick Huang, Chairman, Appointments Committee, University of Windsor, Windsor, Ontario.

Faculty of Physical and Health Education — Assistant Athletic Director. Applications are invited for this position. Duties to commence September 1, 1970. Duties will include directing women's programme, coaching, and instruction in skills in B.P.H.E. programme. Salary will be commensurate with experience and qualifications. Applications, including *curriculum vitae*, should be addressed to : P. J. Galasso, Ph.D., Faculty of Physical and Health Education, University of Windsor, Windsor, Ontario.

**THE DEPARTMENT OF SOCIOLOGY AND ANTHROPOLOGY
THE UNIVERSITY OF CALGARY, ALBERTA**

will offer an

**INTERNATIONAL SYMPOSIUM AND SUMMER INSTITUTE ON
DEVELOPMENT PROCESSES AND DEVELOPING AREAS**

July 2 to August 14, 1970

An initial 3-day Symposium with special emphasis on problems in development, followed by the Institute composed of four pairs of sequential graduate half-courses and one full-course. The Institute will pursue the problems outlined in the Symposium.

For information write :

Summer Session Programme,
Division of Continuing Education,
The University of Calgary,
CALGARY 44, Alberta, Canada.

NOTICE OF PERSONS AVAILABLE FOR APPOINTMENT ** ANNONCE DES PROFESSEURS DISPONIBLES **

- Box 24. History.* Male, 37, has Ph.D. and three years's full-time post-doctoral study and research, has taught European Survey, Renaissance-Reformation, and Canadian History. Has published several articles.
- Box 37. Music.* Canadian, male, 31, family. Ph.D. in Musicology (University of Toronto) expected 1970. Four years' experience teaching Music History/Literature and Theory. Also experienced pianist. Desires teaching position in Canadian university or college. Available June 1, 1970.
- Box 64. English.* Scottish graduate (M.A. with First Class Honours in English), in final stages of doctoral thesis seeks Canadian university post for 1-2 years. Three years' teaching experience at all levels in Scottish university.
- Box 65. Forest Botany.* Canadian male, M.Sc., State College of Forestry, Syracuse, N.Y. Main fields of interest Anatomy and Physiology. Also have practical experience in forest management. Desires a teaching and/or research position.
- Box 66. Business Administration.* Man, 31, family. Doctoral course work complete July, 1970. M.B.A. Previous teaching in Canadian universities, M.B.A., B.Com., and corporate programmes. Interests in Marketing, Management. Available fall, 1970.
- Box 67. Biochemistry.* Canadian, male, 48, family, Ph.D. in Biochemistry and Organic Chemistry. Over ten years' experience in Enzyme, Protein and Lipid Chemistry and Metabolism. Interested in academic position with some teaching and research in Biochemistry or related disciplines. Has own research laboratory. Half-time faculty appointment would also be suitable.

** For fuller information write to the relevant Box No. at the C.A.U.T. National Office, 233 Gilmour St., Suite 700, Ottawa 4, Ontario. Notices of person available for appointment are carried at \$3 for 40 words and \$4 for 50 words. Notices for insertion should be sent to the C.A.U.T. National Office.

** Toute demande de renseignement doit être adressée au numéro indiqué de la case, secrétariat de l'A.C.P.U., 233, rue Gilmour, bureau 700, Ottawa 4, Ontario.
Le taux de l'annonce est fixé à trois dollars pour quarante mots et quatre dollars pour cinquante mots. Les annonces doivent être envoyées au secrétariat de l'A.C.P.U.

- Box 68. Engineering : Mechanical.* Ph.D. 1964. Canadian, publications in Elasticity, Plasticity, Elastic Stability, Head Transfer, Thermodynamics, Fluid Mechanics. Patents. Teaching experience. Seeks position involving teaching and/or introduction of graduate research in Applied Mechanics. Résumé and references on request.
- Box 69. Speech/Drama.* Male, Ph.D. expected June 1970, experienced in teaching, directing, production. Teaching areas : Directing, Criticism, History, Children's theatre, Indian theatre, Oriental and African theatre. Can also teach in interdisciplinary programmes of Asian or Indian Studies. Available September, 1970.
- Box 70. Audiovisual/Counselling Psychology.* Canadian, married, desires teaching and/or research position. Holds several degrees, bilingual. Experienced in most levels of education. Prefers West. Available September 1, 1970.
- Box 71. Philosophy of Law.* Canadian, 32, with Ph.D. in Philosophy (1966) and Ll.B. (1961). Main interests : Philosophy of Law, Philosophy of Language, Philosophy of Mind, Epistemology, Metaphysics, Ethics. One published paper. Five years' teaching experience. Available July 1970.
- Box 72. Mathematics-Statistics and Philosophy or French.* Husband, 44, B.Sc. (Eng.), M.Sc., D.Sc., Ph.D., 18 years' experience in university teaching and research supervision, publications; administration experience in colleges and universities; specialized in numerical and probabilistic analysis in applications and applied functional analysis and differential equations; seeking positions of teaching and research or administration post with his wife, French-Canadian, 37, B.A., B.Péd., Licence en Philosophie (Laval), finished all Ph.D. work, preparing thesis.

THE UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO — THE COLLEGE OF EDUCATION

Invites applications for Sessional or Continuing Appointment, with appropriate rank in **ART EDUCATION**, commencing **1 July or 1 September, 1970**. Salary will be commensurate with qualifications and experience, and competitive with salaries in Canadian schools and universities. Applications for a one-year Sessional Appointment, with the possibility of renewal, will be considered without prejudice. **Address applications or enquiries, with curriculum vitae, to :**

D. F. Dadson, Dean, The College of Education,
University of Toronto,
371 Bloor Street West, Toronto 181, Ontario.



Take a seat at one of your own classes.

It's easy. All you need is a KODAK EKTAGRAPHIC projector and some slides.

KODAK EKTAGRAPHIC projectors mean trouble-free gravity feed, spill-proof trays, rapid tray change and a built-in ruggedness that will take all the work you give them and come back for more. Couple this to a terrific line-up of accessories and you've got versatility unlimited.

There's the EKTAGRAPHIC film strip adapter — turns your jamproof slide projector into a jamproof film strip projector. A sound synchroniser that allows easy showing of synchronised sound-slide programs. A complete range of lenses for superb sharpness and clarity under any conditions. And to show your slides and films, what else but the KODAK EKTALITE screen. You get the brightest image in broad daylight with no loss of detail or color. Get a KODAK EKTAGRAPHIC slide projector, then take a seat and enjoy yourself.

Contact your Kodak dealer, he's in the Yellow Pages, or write:

Education Markets Division.
Canadian Kodak Co., Limited,
Toronto 15, Ont.

Kodak



'Group 80'. Air Canada's lowest-cost way to Europe



This amazingly low new group affinity return fare is yours when you organize and fly with at least 79 other members of a bonafide association or organization, the main aim of which is not travel, and of which you have been a member for at least six months.

You go and return as a group on regularly scheduled flights. And you can stay as long as a year.

Air Canada affinity 'Group 80' Economy Class fares apply from major cities in Canada to dozens of exciting European cities. Start your 1970 holiday planning now. Air Canada can clear up any questions you may have about organizing your group. But do it now and make your arrangements very soon to get the benefit of the lowest affinity 'Group 80' fares of the year.

To London from	In effect from		
	Now to Mar. 31 Nov. 1 — Mar. 31/71	Apr. 1 — May 31 Aug. 10 — Oct. 31	June 1 — Aug. 9
Montreal	\$165	\$189	\$236
Toronto	\$187	\$211	\$257
Winnipeg	\$214	\$238	\$285
Vancouver	\$271	\$294	\$342

Ask about affinity 'Group 25' and 'Group 40' fares as well. For all the details, call Air Canada. Fares subject to Government approval.

Go 'Group 80'

AIR CANADA





COMPARATIVE WALL ATLASES

The comparative Wall Atlas style of map is popular because of the convenient size and the fact that only one phase of geography is dealt with in each map. The size of each map is 43 x 33 inches. The titles of the series on NORTH AMERICA are:

1. Relief of Land, Political and Communications.
2. Climate: Summer Conditions, Rainfall, Isobars, Winds.
3. Climate: Winter Conditions, Rainfall, Isobars, Winds.
4. Actual Temperature: July, and July Sea-level Isotherms.
5. Actual Temperature: January, and January Sea-level Isotherms.
6. Natural Vegetation.
7. Commercial Development.
8. Density of Population.

Supplementary map, Political and Communications, obtainable separately.

Other series available: Canada; South America; Europe; Asia; Africa; Australia and New Zealand; World-Relations; Commercial Development; British Isles; India, Pakistan, Ceylon and Burma; South Africa.

Mounted on cloth, dissected to fold with eyelets for hanging.

No. 30-11 — Single Maps, each	\$ 4.50
Any Eight Maps for	31.75
Style 9 — Any Eight Maps, on charthead with tripod stand, for	49.75

maps that display the chief facts of geography

These maps fulfill the requirement that "Maps should be used not only to locate places but to work out relationships between climate and vegetation, or between natural resources and population density."

*A statement from the Introduction to the 1962 curriculum 1:7 x 1:9, Geography, History and Government Social Studies (Intermediate Division), Dept. of Education, Ontario.

REGIONAL WALL MAPS — Physical/Political — An up-to-date series of physical/political maps. Beautifully coloured to indicate the relief of the land, and sea depths. Communications, boundaries and other necessary details are included.

FRANCE AND THE LOW COUNTRIES — Eastward to Bremen and Turin, with inset of Corsica. 36 x 46 inches. Scale 1:1,250,000 (20 miles to 1 inch).

CENTRAL EUROPE — From Bornholm to Ljubljana, and Amsterdam to Brest. 46 x 36 inches. Scale 1:1,250,000 (20 miles to 1 inch).

SCANDINAVIA — From Hammerfest to Kiel, and Stavanger to Vyborg. 36 x 46 inches. Scale 1:1,750,000 (28 miles to 1 inch).

THE NEAR EAST AND MIDDLE EAST — From Kiev to Berbera, and Corfu to Muscat. 37 x 48 inches. Scale 1:4,000,000 (64 miles to 1 inch).

THE MEDITERRANEAN LANDS — 48 x 36 inches. Scale 1:4,000,000 (64 miles to 1 inch).

THE FAR EAST — From Irkutsk to Timor, and Chittagong to the Marianna Islands. 37 x 48 inches. Scale 1:6,500,000 (104 miles to 1 inch).

GHANA — 34 x 22 inches. Scale 1:1,000,000 (16 miles to 1 inch).

NIGERIA — 42 x 33 inches. Scale 1:1,400,000 (22 miles to 1 inch).

CENTRAL AFRICA — The Rhodesias, Nyasaland, and parts of bordering territories. 37 x 46 inches. Scale 1:1,750,000 (28 miles to 1 inch).

EAST AFRICA — Including the whole of Lakes Rudolph and Nyasa, with an inset extension of Port Herald. 36 x 48 inches. Scale 1:1,900,000 (30 miles to 1 inch).

PACIFIC OCEAN — 48 x 36 inches. Scale 1:20,000,000. Also available are Physical/Political maps of Kenya, Uganda, Tanganyika, Jamaica. Size and scale comparable to those listed above.

REGIONAL WALL MAPS — Political

WEST AFRICA — From Nouakchott to Bata (Rio Muni), from Dakar to Lake Chad. 24½ x 37 inches. Scale 1:4,000,000 (64 miles to 1 inch).

SOUTH-EAST ASIA — From Canton to Darwin, Andaman Islands to Hollandia. 46 x 36 inches. Scale 1:5,000,000 (80 miles to 1 inch).

WEST INDIES COMMITTEE MAP — 48 x 37 inches. Scale 1:3,500,000 (55 miles to 1 inch).

No. 30-12 Regional Wall Maps —	
Style No. 11 — Mounted on wooden rods, each	7.95
Style No. 24 — Mounted on wooden spring rollers, each	13.25
Style No. 9 — Any 8 maps, on charthead with tripod stand, for	57.75

MOYER DIVISION VILAS INDUSTRIES LIMITED

MONCTON - MONTREAL - TORONTO - WINNIPEG - SASKATOON - EDMONTON - VANCOUVER



Commission on post-secondary education in Ontario

THE COMMISSION ON POST-SECONDARY EDUCATION IN ONTARIO

invites communication from all individuals and groups who feel they have a contribution to make to the work of the Commission.

The Commission is concerned with the following issues:

- learning and teaching ● aims and objectives
- functions and viability of institutions ● decision-making
- costs and benefits, to individuals and to society
- alternatives for the future

This announcement may be of interest to those who would like to:

- indicate intention to submit a brief
- make available to the Commission the results of previous work
- develop discussion papers for presentation to the Commission
- initiate studies in their field of competence
- quote on specific research studies for the Commission

A schedule for public hearings will be made known at a later date.

The Commission is anxious at this time to identify any individuals or groups who are interested in undertaking sponsored research.

The 'Terms of Reference' of the Commission and 'Guidelines for Submitting Research Proposals' are available upon request from:

THE SECRETARY / COMMISSION ON POST-SECONDARY EDUCATION IN ONTARIO /
SUITE 203 / 505 UNIVERSITY AVENUE / TORONTO 2 / ONTARIO